WILLIAM H. AUD

BX 5199 .L28 H87 1895
Hutton, William Holden, 186(
-1930.
William Laud

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/williamlaud00hutt_0

Leaders of Religion

Edited by H. C. Beeching, M.A.

WILLIAM LAUD

ARCHBISHOP LAUD

From the Picture by Vandyke
Formerly in the possession of Sir Robert Walpole, now in the Hermitage Gallery, St. Petersburg.

WILLIAM LAUD

BY

WILLIAM HOLDEN HUTTON, B.D.

FELLOW, TUTOR, PRECENTOR, AND LIBRARIAN OF S. JOHN BAPTIST COLLEGE, OXFORD,
AND EXAMINER IN THE HONOUR SCHOOL OF MODERN HISTORY

WITH A PORTRAIT

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY
The Riverside Press, Cambridge
1895

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	FROM READING TO CANTERBURY	1
II.	PRIVATE LIFE AND FRIENDS	36
III.	LAUD AND THE CHURCH	58
IV.	LAUD AND THE STATE	123
V.	THEOLOGY, AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS ROME ...	139
VI.	FOREIGN REFORMED BODIES: IRELAND AND SCOTLAND	161
VII.	TROUBLES, TRIAL, AND DEATH	187
VIII.	MEMORIALS AND CHARACTER	229

PREFACE

THE uncritical impetuosity which a generation ago overwhelmed with contumely, sarcasm, and unhistorical rhetoric the name of William Laud has, it is to be hoped, now spent itself. There still lingers among those whose historical knowledge is based upon the obiter dicta of the partisans of fifty years ago a curious survival of prejudice which is due to ignorance as much as to sectarian bigotry; but the calm and judicial investigation of writers more informed and less biassed is teaching us to read the history of the seventeenth century in a spirit very different from that of some of our predecessors. Those who value the teaching of the past owe a deep debt to the luminous and judicial work of Leopold von Ranke. Beside that great and honoured name students of the Stewart age will gratefully place that of Samuel Rawson Gardiner. It is impossible for any one who works at this very difficult and complicated period adequately to acknowledge the enormous obligation under which he stands to Mr. Gardiner's knowledge and patience and fairness. It is not the least of his services to the cause of truth that he has done more than any other living writer to enable men to critically examine and justly estimate the career of Laud.

Attention has lately been directed, with unusual interest, to the life of the great English churchman of the seventeenth century. 'A Romish Recusant,' attracted to his subject by its theological as well as historical associations, has published a long and interesting biography, which has not unnaturally something of a controversial tone. It is difficult to exclude controversy when writing the life of the prominent champion of a religious body to which the author does not belong: and there are obvious advantages to the justice of an historical estimate when the writer is able to enter fully into the principles which guided the action of his hero. The Rev. C. H. Simpkinson has also published a valuable sketch of Laud's *Life and Times*.

I had already undertaken to write a life of Laud before the two recent works which I have mentioned had been announced. I have had the advantage of consulting the work of the 'Romish Recusant' while writing some part of my own book; but before Mr. Simpkinson's volume was published a great part of my manuscript was in print, so that I have not been materially indebted to it.

Other modern biographies or essays I have endeavoured as far as possible to avoid. I have not looked for some time at Mr. A. C. Benson's sketch or Dr. Mozley's essay. I have tried to write anew the story of a life which I think will still bear telling again.

The contemporary authorities are very numerous. Chief among them are Laud's own *Works*, very completely collected in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology in seven volumes, 1847—1860. Heylin in his *Cyprianus Anglicus* became the Archbishop's first

biographer. Prynne, in his *Breviate, Hidden Works of Darkness,* and *Canterburie's Doome,* takes the part of *advocatus diaboli,* but gives much valuable information. The *State Papers, Domestic,* contain, as might be expected, an enormous amount of matter directly or indirectly illustrating Laud's career. These are the primary sources of our information. Besides these there are the contemporary historians, private letters, and a large mass of pamphlet literature. Of all these, as well as of special authorities for particular epochs and of local records and memorials, I have endeavoured to make use. For many of the pamphlets, as loans or gifts, I am indebted to Mr. C. H. Firth, whose generosity is as great as his knowledge. Almost all the material is printed, in some form or other: but happily there is still the interest of handling, at Lambeth, in the Record Office, and in Oxford, the very sheets on which the firm neat handwriting of the Archbishop may be so clearly read. These records are generally accessible.

For the history of the trial I have been able, through the kindness of the Provost and Fellows of Worcester College, to whom, and especially to the Librarian, Mr. Pottinger, I am greatly indebted, to gain additional information from a volume of the Clarke papers (Worcester College MS. 71 N. 12), which has not, so far as I can discover, been till now used by any writer on the period.

William Clarke became a student of the Inner Temple within a year of the Archbishop's execution. From the internal evidence of his MS. I should judge that he attended the trial constantly, noting down at the time all that he could of the speeches and the evidence (for the MS. contains blanks as if caused by

the difficulty of keeping up with the speakers), and on days when he was absent briefly epitomizing the information he received from other sources. Clarke does not add very materially to our knowledge of the proceedings, but he gives occasional details which are of interest, and he affords an independent evidence of the truth of the account which Laud himself composed. Other volumes of the Clarke MSS. are being edited by Mr. C. H. Firth. It is to be hoped that this volume also may be made generally known.

It will be obvious to any one who reads this book that I have never been outside the guidance of Mr. Gardiner's *History of England* and his *History of the Great Civil War*. Where I have had the temerity to disagree with some of his conclusions, it has only been after a strenuous effort to view the particular points from the same standpoint as that of the subject of my memoir. The facts which Mr. Gardiner has placed so fully and so judicially before his readers are sometimes, I think, capable of an interpretation different to that which he has given them. My debt to Mr. Gardiner is one which I share with all students of English history. All who desire to obtain a just estimate of the Church history of the period should also be acquainted with Archdeacon Perry's *History of the Church of England*, with Dr. Bright's *Essay on Laud*, and with Mr. Wakeman's admirable and sympathetic book, *The Church and the Puritans*. My personal thanks are due no less to those who have aided my own work—to the Dean of Gloucester, to Dr. A. J. Mason, vicar of the church in which Laud's body was laid till the Restoration, to Mr. Kershaw, Librarian of Lambeth, and especially to the Lord Bishop of

S. David's, whose kindness I cannot adequately acknowledge.

I am under a peculiar obligation to the able and learned writer who has assumed the name of 'A Romish Recusant.' Knowing nothing of me, he offered, in the truest spirit of the courtesy of Letters, to assist me in every way. He generously gave me the rare pamphlet, *The Recantation of the Prelate of Canterbury*, lent me *Laud's Labyrinth*, and never wearied of answering questions or discussing points upon which we "agree to differ."

In my own college I have the great privilege of being guardian of the chiefest of the Laudian relics, and there is much matter of interest in our possession of which I have been able to avail myself to the full.

My book has been written in the midst of great pressure of other work and continual interruptions, and I am painfully aware of its defects: but, such as it is, I offer it as an attempt justly and historically to estimate the character of the great man to whose pure, conscientious, and steadfast soul the Church of England owes so much.

WILLIAM LAUD

CHAPTER I.

FROM READING TO CANTERBURY.

THE seventeenth century saw a long crisis in the history of the English State and of the English Church. The heroic age of Elizabeth had left behind it grave problems, but the wise men and the heroes who might have solved them with the pen or the sword were no more. The stress and terror which had made men gladly suffer the Tudor despotism passed away as England rose from the political reconstruction of Europe a compact and independent power; and with them passed the enthusiasm of loyalty and the willing sacrifice of individual opinion.

The task that lay before the first two Stewarts was as difficult as that which Elizabeth had so triumphantly achieved, and it was a task toward which her example afforded but little assistance. Problems not wholly new, but with new features, were pressing for solution. Should England become a despotic monarchy, like the monarchy in which the strength of France was being concentrated? The question was answered by great political conflicts, great political theories, and a great

civil war. In religion the question was no less pressing. Should the English Church be severed by its own act from the historic continuity which State law and ecclesiastical formularies had at the period of the Reformation itself so carefully preserved? Since the bull of 1570, it seemed impossible to heal the definite breach with Rome: a few years later the division between the two parties in the English Church became as irreconcilable. The successors of those who had guided the Church through her period of change were satisfied with what had been done, and content to abide in the old paths. But stronger and stronger grew the opposition of those whose ideal was freedom from all that was implied by the continuity of the Church.

So long as Elizabeth lived the respect and submission which had become traditional made men acquiesce in decisions of the State which a later generation would consider arbitrary and intolerable. The Englishmen of the sixteenth century had not been unwilling to have their religious differences settled for them: those of the seventeenth were determined to decide them for themselves.

Should the reforming movement proceed further? Should England consciously sever her ties with her religious past and the past of historic Christendom? It was this to which the seventeenth century was to reply. It fell to one man to embody the answer in a life of profound influence and eventfulness.

Born at the crisis of the breach with Rome, with his young enthusiasm fired by the triumph over the Armada, brought up both in the new learning of the late English Renaissance and in the old humanities which the Church and the grammar schools had still

preserved, the greatest archbishop who has sat in the chair of Augustine since the Reformation lived to lay his head upon the block amid the apparent failure of all his aims, when yet he had relaid firm and deep the old foundations, which had seemed at his birth to be so grievously endangered.

William Laud was born at Reading on October 7, 1573.

"The greatest rivers many times have the smallest fountains, such as can hardly be found out, and being found out, as hardly quit the cost of the discovery; and yet by long running and holding on a constant and continual course, they become large, navigable, and of great benefit unto the publick. Whereas some families may be compared to the *Pyramides of Ægypt*, which being built on great foundations, grow narrower and narrower by degrees, until at last they end in a small *conus*, in a point, in nothing."

Such is Heylin's retort to those who, when his hero had become famous, delighted to taunt him with the meanness of his birth,—Prynne, Lord Brooke, and the base libellers who cut to the quick the man sensitive of his father's honour. We should say now that Laud was one of the middle class, "a man," as he said himself, "of ordinary but very honest birth."

His father was a clothier in a large way of business. His mother had been twice married, and William Laud was her tenth child: her brother, Sir William Webb, some years after became Lord Mayor of London. Their house has long disappeared, and its site is covered by a block of buildings in Broad Street called Laud's Place.

William Laud was his father's only child, and it is clear that the utmost was done for him when he was a

boy to develop the masterful intellect that early made itself apparent. The father prospered, and when he died left a comfortable estate to his son. The boy was well taught at Reading School by a master severe even for the fashion of those times. Archbishop Neile, his early patron and later supporter, used to say of himself that the beatings he had at Westminster made him a poor scholar all his life. It was not so with Laud. He profited so well and came on so fast, that when he was sixteen years of age (which, says Heylin, was very early for those times) he was sent to Oxford. He matriculated on October 17, 1589, as a Commoner of S. John's College.

It appears at first that he was supported by the liberality of a friend or kinswoman; but on S. John's Day, 1590, he was chosen scholar of his college, and he obtained his Fellowship three years later. Of his life as an undergraduate little is known. It appears that his chamber-fellow (for it was not until a century later that the scholars obtained separate rooms) was one Jones, a Merchant Taylors' scholar; but of their intimacy Laud says nothing.[1]

His father died in 1594, and in the same year he took his Bachelor's degree. The weak health from which he suffered all through his later life manifested itself strongly during the years 1596 and 1597. In the next year he proceeded to his Master's degree, and began to take part in the educational work of the college.

From a small provincial town, not untouched by the beginnings of Puritanism, Laud had come to a great

[1] See *Works*, iv. 317, 344. This Jones afterwards became a Benedictine and Professor at Douay, and was known as Fr. Leander a S. Martino.

University where Calvinism was dominant but not uncontested. His own college was one of the smallest and least important. It was a new foundation, endowed but thirty-four years before by a London merchant, Sir Thomas White, and settled in the buildings of an old Cistercian house. The hall and chapel were those of the monastery; the fine old cellars belonged too to the good old days; and there still stood the statue of the holy Bernard over the great gateway. Sharp-witted young men when they find themselves in a place of much freedom and little responsibility are not generally eager to adopt the opinions of their elders. If there is a tutor who takes a different line from the others, his enthusiasm will win many converts. It was so with Laud. The college itself had never been violently Protestant. Edmund Campian, the Jesuit, had been trained there, and when Tobie Matthew, who was President, and rose to be Archbishop of York, wrote against his doctrines, he appealed to Catholic tradition and Holy Scripture rather than its modern interpreters. Many of the Fellows had suffered for their opinions. Again and again occurs the entry in the college annals, "Alteratâ religione aut evasit aut deprivatus est." Yet the example of the founder had permanent effect. He had obtained the charter of incorporation and drawn up his statutes under Queen Mary; but he followed the English Church in its repudiation of the Papal Supremacy. Probably the difference did not seem great to the devout London merchant. If the Pope could entertain the thought of accepting the English Prayer-Book, it must be enough for a plain man. And so the college drew to itself men who thought with him.

Prominent among these was John Buckeridge, and to

him Laud became pupil. The learning and goodness of the tutor had their effect, and the lad grew up to found his study "upon the noble foundations of the fathers, councils, and the ecclesiastical historians," and to stand boldly opposed to the dominant Calvinism of the University. From Buckeridge and his pupil in S. John's came the much-needed re-assertion of the principles upon which the English Reformation had been carried through.

As a graduate, Laud soon began to come to the front in the University. He was ordained deacon January 4, 1600, and priest on Palm Sunday, 1601. He had already been "grammar reader" of his college: in 1602 he held a divinity lectureship. In 1603 he became proctor,[1] and during his year of office took, after the custom of his college, the degree of Bachelor of Divinity. His colleague as proctor was Christopher Dale of Merton College, whose severity was contrasted with Laud's mildness.[2] It is clear that he was no stern recluse, but took a keen interest in the amusements of the University. When he was proctor, we find the porter of S. John's (one Frank Clarke, a famous character for humour) sending him a letter of mock apology for breaking a head with his black staff, written no doubt by some smart scholar, which is proof enough of the friendly terms on which he stood with the college servants. Laud, he said, had condoned his "delictes and crimes," and restored him "out of the porter's lodge of misery into the tower of felicity." In

[1] It might be taken as an instance of his lenity, that the *Liber Niger Procuratorum* contains no single record of punishment during his tenure of office: but the book was not kept very exactly at that time.

[2] *Wood's Life and Times* (Clark), vol. ii., p. 234.

the Christmas plays of the college he bore such part as a senior could, by "subsidizing" the actors. The famous account of the "Christmas Prince,"[1] the most complete record of an University "mumming" that we possess, shows him as contributing generously to the funds out of which the properties were provided. He had no Puritan horror of stage-plays. The acting of the S. John's scholars was a prominent feature of his reception of the King in 1636. "I was never play-hunter," he said at Prynne's trial, "but I have observed at Court some Puritans to be at a play because they would not be thought Puritans; and for better testimony that they have been there have stood under the candlestick and been dropped on by the candles, and so have carried away a remembrance of the place. If your lordships, after pains taken in the managing of State affairs, grow weary, what is fitter than to take your recreations? But Mr. Prynne will not allow you to see a play—they are, in his opinion, *mala per se*. But I say, take away the scurf and rubbish which they are incident unto, they are things indifferent."[2]

In the year in which he was made proctor, Laud entered into a wider world by his appointment as chaplain to Charles Blount, Earl of Devon. Famous as a warrior and a politician, there yet lay upon his patron's life the dark stain of a shameful intrigue. Penelope Devereux, Lord Essex's daughter, had been half affianced to him, as she had been to Philip Sidney: she was forced into a marriage with Lord Rich. The marriage was a wretched one. Sidney's own exquisite sonnets

[1] S. John's College MSS. A few copies were printed in 1816. Miss Lee has edited (1893) the Christmas play of 1602, *Narcissus*, and has appended the porter's letter quoted above.

[2] *Works*, vi. 236.

trace the course of his passion for Stella; but the virtue which denied her love to Astrophel did not resist the assault of another lover. Lady Rich became before many years the avowed mistress of Charles Blount, who had succeeded to his brother's title of Lord Mountjoy, and afterwards been created Earl of Devon for his services in Ireland. She was divorced; and Lord Devon endeavoured to make what reparation seemed possible for him. In 1605 Laud was asked to marry the guilty couple: he consented. The day on which he solemnized the unhallowed wedding, the Feast of S. Stephen, was ever after observed by him in remorse and penitence as a strict fast. His prayers show how deeply he regretted his error. It was the great blot upon his life: but it is not difficult to understand the strong inducements which had weighed with him. Ambition has been assigned as a cause.[1] If it was so, never was ambition so ill-served, for Lord Devon was at once disgraced by the King, who could not tolerate the re-marriage of divorced persons, and died within a year, while Laud too fell under the King's displeasure, and was for a long time shut out from all preferment. It is incredible that James's views on divorce should not have been known, and it is certain that Laud had stronger and more well-grounded stimulants than ambition. Pity for the unhappy woman,[2] round whose life the beauty of Sidney's romantic devotion still lingered—the knowledge that there had been what might serve as a pre-contract *in foro conscientiæ*, as Heylin says, though not *in foro judicii*—and the sup-

[1] "Serving my ambition and the sins of others," he says in his own prayer of penitence.

[2] Mr. Benson, *Life of Laud*, thinks the pathetic picture at Lambeth is her portrait, kept with a touching fidelity by Laud.

port of some divines of eminence,[1]—these may well have moved him. He was a young man, and his bitterest critics, if they cannot forgive him, may well remember that he could never forgive himself.

There remain at Lambeth and in the Record Office, two curious relics of the unhappy affair. At Lambeth[2] is preserved the "discourse written by ye Earl of Devonshire in defence of his marriage with ye Lady Rich," in his own hand. After being presented to the King, it seems to have passed into the hands of Laud. Among the State Papers of James I. lies the "Censure of the Earl of Devonshire's tract touching marriage and divorce, by William Laud."[3] When he wrote this Laud had ceased to justify his action. "The authority of the canon law—true," he comments, "to putting away his wife; but neither silent nor unexpressed to marry again." He adds a pathetic note as to the circumstances under which he came to write. Lord Devon's tract was "committed to me to read over twice," and the answer is page by page. "These papers were in my lord's hands when he died."

Thus we may leave the unhappy business and return to Laud's work at the University. He had already, by his exercises for the degree of B.D., when he discussed the efficacy of baptism, taken his stand against the ultra-Protestant teaching then current. Preaching at S. Mary's on October 20, he maintained the Catholic doctrine and position of the English Church. The Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Airay, Provost of Queen's, at once "picked a quarrel" with him, and he was "con-

[1] See Heylin, *Cypr. Angl.*, p. 58; and cf. Cosin's *Argument on the Dissolution of Marriage.*

[2] MS. 943, f. 47.

[3] *State Papers, Domestic*, vol. xx., no. 53.

vented." The examination of a sermon by the Vice-Chancellor, and certain Doctors of Divinity opposed to the preacher, is not an unfamiliar feature in the career of any great Oxford leader of religion. All who have been subjected to the ordeal have not fared so well as Laud. It chanced that Sir William Paddy, the King's physician, and M.P. for Thetford, himself a S. John's man, heard the sermon in S. Mary's, and he at once wrote to the Chancellor, the Earl of Dorset, to inform him of the facts, and stated that moreover "some two or three very learned men of the Court had seen and considered of his sermon, and had given approbation of the same." The Chancellor immediately wrote to Dr. Airay, speaking of Sir William Paddy as his "good friend, a man religious, learned, and one whom I love and trust," and suggesting a reference to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London. The Vice-Chancellor hastily retreated from his opposition, and ceased all proceedings against Laud.

From this date ecclesiastical preferments came to him in abundance. Sir Thomas Cave gave him the living of Stanford in Northamptonshire in 1607: to this was added North Kilworth, 1608 (exchanged for West Tilbury in 1609), and Cuckston in 1610. On June 6, 1608, he took the degree of D.D., declaring in his thesis the divine right of episcopacy—not without unfavourable comment.[1]

Meanwhile his old college tutor had not forgotten

[1] "My tenet was, and still is, that *episcopatus* is *jure divino*." Marginal notes on Prynne's Breviate, in *Works*, iii. 262. Prynne says Dr. Holland, the Regius Professor, "publicly reprehended him in the schools," but Laud says "it is a notorious untruth that Dr. Holland said any such thing." Mr. Gardiner, *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, Art. "Laud," has confused this occasion with the B.D. Heylin makes the same mistake. See Laud's *Works*, as above.

him, and after the death of Lord Devon recommended him to Dr. Neile, Bishop of Rochester, whose chaplain he became on August 5, 1608. Neile, says Heylin very happily, was "a man who very well understood the constitution of the Church of England, though otherwise not so eminent in all parts of learning as some other bishops of his time; but what he wanted in himself he made good in the choice of his servants, having more able men about him from time to time than any other of that age;" and he adds, "none of his chaplains was received so much into his counsels as Dr. Laud, whom he found both an active and a trusty servant, as afterwards a most constant and faithful friend upon all occasions."[1] From Neile Laud received several of his preferments, and through him the King first took notice of him. He preached at Theobald's, September 17, 1609, and on November 20, 1610, he received the grant in reversion of a prebend in Westminster Abbey.[2] In the same year he resigned his Fellowship, in order to devote himself to his work as chaplain and parish priest. It might seem as if the dominant Calvinism had banished him from the University. But he was not long to be absent.

"His good friend and tutor, Dr. Buckeridge," says Heylin, "being nominated successor unto Neile in the see of Rochester,[3] laid a good ground for his succession in the Presidentship of S. John's College, thereby to render him considerable in the University." Buckeridge had done so much for his college, that his influence had rightly great weight with the Fellows in their choice of a successor. It was rumoured in the University that

[1] *Cyprianus Anglicus*, pp. 59, 60.
[2] *Calendar of State Papers, Dom.*, 1603-10, p. 644.
[3] When Neile was translated to Lichfield.

Laud would be elected, and the Calvinists took alarm. George Abbot, elected to the see of Canterbury on the death of Bancroft, formerly Master of University and Vice-Chancellor, had known Laud in Oxford and distrusted his opinions. By his influence, the Lord Chancellor, Elsmere, who succeeded Bancroft as Chancellor of the University, approached the King with charges of popery and prophecies of disaster to Oxford if Laud were given power. Whatever may have been James's sympathies in the matter—and it is known that he did not like Laud—he was too shrewd or too just to interfere prematurely in a matter of merely academic interest.

The election proceeded. On May 10, 1611, the Fellows met in the chapel. When the nomination papers had been laid on the altar,[1] and before the Vice-President had announced the result, one of the Fellows, who supported another candidate for the headship,[2] snatched the paper and tore it in pieces. The Visitor, Bishop Bilson of Winchester, referred the matter to the King.[3] James "sat in person for three hours to hear" the cause. The day, as Laud—to whom coincidences were somewhat of omens—notes, was The Beheading of S. John Baptist in the Church Calendar; and the King, after his patient hearing, confirmed Laud as President, "considering that the election was no further corrupt and partial than all elections are liable to be," and ordered that "clearer interpretation of the statutes be made for the future."[4]

[1] This was till recently the custom at all college elections.

[2] Dr. E. Rawlinson, formerly Fellow, afterwards Principal of S. Edmund Hall.

[3] *Cal. of State Papers*, June 14, Aug. 5, 1611.

[4] *Ibid.*, Sept. 23, 1611.

He might take a lawful pride in his success, for it was won by no personal intrigue. Years later he said, "When I was chosen there was a bitter faction both raised and countenanced against me (I will forbear to relate how and by whom). But this is certain, I made no party there; for four being in nomination for that headship, I lay then so sick at London, that I was neither able to go down nor so much as write to my friends about it."[1]

He showed a remarkable absence of all personal feeling, indeed, in all that concerned his election. His chief opponent had been the young Fellow named Richard Baylie, who had torn up the voting papers. Laud showed him special favour, procured his election as proctor in 1615, married him to his brother's daughter, when he became bishop made him chancellor of S. David's Cathedral and his own chaplain, and eventually raised him to be President of S. John's and Vice-Chancellor.

During the years he now spent in Oxford, Laud devoted himself to the domestic governance of his own society, and to the task of theological reformation in the University.

At first he had great difficulty in college. His opponents "continued very eager and bitter." But "the audit of the college for the year's accounts, and choice of new officers, followed in November; there so God blessed me," he says in later years, "with patience and moderation in the choice of all offices, that I made all quiet in the college. And for all the narrowness of my comprehensions (it is a retort to those who then, as men do now, called him 'narrow'), I governed that

[1] *Works*, v. 88.

college in peace, without so much as the show of a faction, all my time, which was near upon eleven years."

The college books amply support this statement, and the college annalists speak enthusiastically of his moderation and generosity. The period of Laud's connection with S. John's marks the rise of the college from a poor and struggling foundation, owing its presidents to the favour of Christ Church and its continued existence to almost chance benefactions, to a position of prominence, if not preponderance, in the University. The energy of Laud was largely responsible for this change; but Buckeridge, Juxon, Paddy, Baylie, each had share, in different ways, as churchman, man of business, courtier, and industrious worker in college business, in raising the status of Sir Thomas White's foundation.

Laud's return to the University plunged him at once into its theological squabbles. Robert Abbot, Master of Balliol, elder brother of the Archbishop, became Regius Professor of Divinity in 1612. "Depending altogether on the will of his brother, he thought he could not gratify and oblige him more than by pursuing the old quarrels against Laud." He was not long without occasion. A sermon of Laud's, Catholic and anti-Puritan, roused his ire, and he retorted, at the next opportunity, from the University pulpit—"Might not Christ say, What art thou, Romish or English, Papist or Protestant? Or what art thou?—a mongrel compound of both: a Protestant by ordination, a Papist in point of free will, inherent righteousness, and the like. A Protestant in receiving the Sacrament; a Papist in the doctrine of the Sacrament. What, do you think there be two Heavens? If there be, get you to

the other and place yourselves there, for into this where I am ye shall not come."[1] This stuff had been preached on a Saint's Day, and was repeated on the Sunday following, and Laud boldly sat through it. Men pointed their fingers at him in the church, and it was counted heresy to speak to him, and suspicion of heresy to greet him in the street. But the opposition was too coarse to be strong, and Laud lived it down. We have no details, but we know that in ten years the current of University partisanship ran all in his favour. He consulted Neile as to how to treat the censure, and apparently received conciliatory advice, for no more was said, and Abbot became Bishop of Salisbury in 1615. Prideaux, his successor in the Professorship, was also a Puritan, but Laud was more than a match for him.

Soon after his election to S. John's the King made Laud his chaplain. In 1614 he received a prebend[2] in Lincoln Cathedral, and next year became Archdeacon of Huntingdon.

The duties of his headship and his archdeaconry were not sufficient to occupy all the time of so energetic a man as Laud. The King, whatever he may have thought of his character, did not underrate his ability, and at length in 1616 gave him the deanery of Gloucester. He had seemingly a special object,[3] and he desired the new Dean at once to take in hand the reformation of the cathedral. "His Majesty," says Laud, writing to the Bishop of Gloucester, "was

[1] Quoted by Heylin, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, p. 67.

[2] Buckden.

[3] Mr. Gardiner, *History of England*, iii. 245, thinks he had begun to regret his appointment of a Calvinist, Miles Smith, to the bishopric.

graciously pleased to tell me he was informed that there was scarce ever a church in England so ill-governed and so much out of order; and withal required me in general to reform and set in order what I found there amiss." [1] The new Dean at once began his reforms. He was installed on December 20, 1616. At the next meetings of the chapter, on January 15 and 17, 1617,[2] it was agreed that the necessary repairs of the cathedral be immediately undertaken; and secondly, that the Holy Table be placed at the east end of the choir, the place appointed for it by Queen Elizabeth's injunctions and by the unaltered practice of the royal chapels and most of the cathedrals.[3] In making this alteration it is clear that Laud did not regard himself as an innovator. "The city," says Heylin, "was at that time much pestered with the Puritan faction, which was grown multitudinous and strong by reason of the small abode which the Dean and prebendaries made amongst them, the dull connivance of their bishop, and the remiss government

[1] *Works*, vi. 239, Feb. 27, 1616-17.

[2] Act Book of Gloucester Chapter. See Laud's *Works*, iv. 233.

[3] Cf. Archbishop of Canterbury's judgment, Read and others *v.* Bishop of Lincoln, 1890, p. 22 *sqq.* The question of the "eastward position" is not mentioned by Laud as arising at Gloucester. The Archbishop's judgment does not appear to observe the significance of the fact, that when the position of the altar was fixed at the east end the rubrical direction of "North side" was retained. It is not to be presumed that Laud either forgot or ignored the rubric. It should also be observed, that Laud's own orders (cf. *Works*, v. 495) direct that the *ends* of the altar should stand "north and south." It would appear therefore that he interpreted the expression "north side" in conjunction with "before the table," as implying a position at the north end of the west side of the altar. Cf. Archbishop's judgment, p. 40. "It seems that ministers who officiated before the table still held to the letter of the rubric by standing towards the north part."

of their metropolitan, so that it seemed both safe and easy to some of the rabble to make an outcry in all places that popery was coming in."[1] The bishop declared that he would not enter the cathedral again. One of his chaplains wrote a letter which was circulated as a popular libel attacking the chapter.[2] Alderman Jones, before whom some who were distributing the pamphlet were brought, advised the chapter to bring the libellers before the High Commission. But Laud after the Chapter meeting had retired quietly to Oxford. He was in favour of no such extreme measures. He merely wrote to the bishop referring to the Chapter Act as based upon law and custom. To his patron Neile he wrote also, "I beseech your lordship let me have your lawful assistance that so long as I do nothing but that which is established and practised in our Church, I may not be brought into contempt at my first entrance upon that place by any turbulent spirits, and so disenabled to do that good service which I owe to the Church of God." The whole business did not lie heavy upon his mind: he had clear warrant for his action,[3] and in less than a month he set out for Scotland with the King.[4]

It was only at its beginning that Laud's tenure of the deanery was stormy. He remained Dean till he received the bishopric of S. David's in 1621, and was constantly present at chapter meetings.[5] He did the

[1] *Cyprianus Anglicus*, p. 70.

[2] See Prynne's *Canterburie's Doome*, pp. 75—78.

[3] Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, Wilkins, *Concilia*, iv. 188. And cf. the declaration of precedent given in the canons of 1640 (Laud's *Works*, vi. 625), which clearly represent Laud's mind.

[4] On March 14, 1616-17. See Diary.

[5] Information kindly given by the chapter clerk of Gloucester.

work that he was intended to do, but other claims pressed on him. He has left no distinct traces on the most exquisite of English cathedrals.[1] The restoration which he took in hand has been merged in other restorations, and the cathedral suffered exceptionally during the civil wars; only a little wood-work of Jacobean renaissance remains to preserve his memory at Gloucester.[2]

His work at Oxford had received the King's sanction. In 1616 James himself intervened in academic affairs by sending instructions to the Vice-Chancellor, which influenced the theological studies of the University in the direction of Laud's views. Preachers were to adhere to the distinctive teaching of the Church, and students in Divinity were to be "excited to bestow their time on the Fathers and Councils, schoolmen, histories and controversies"—a wider field than Puritanism approved—"making them the grounds of their studies."

James at last gave Laud a bishopric. On June 3,

[1] He used his knowledge of Gloucester later during his metropolitical visitation. Cf. *Works*, v. 480-1 as to the dean's and mayor's seats. Did he remember any naughty boys of his own time when he ordered "that Thomas Longe and Richard Longe, two of your choristers who are presented for incorrigible boys, be forthwith removed from their places and others chosen in their rooms"?

[2] The present Dean, so famous for knowledge and love of his cathedral, very kindly writes to me as follows—"I could not definitely say that there was any 'Laudian' work in the cathedral. The Renaissance altar rails in the Lady Chapel are, I think, some 30 or 40 years later. . . . The door leading into the Monks' Parlour beneath my Library is dated 1614—two years before Laud became dean. Similar but rather better work panels my drawing-room. *Probably* this *was* Laud's doing. Some wood-work on the organ-loft, south side, is of a similar character, and is likely to have been his doing."

1621, he spoke graciously, says the Diary, "concerning my long service. He was pleased to say he had given me nothing but Gloucester, which he well knew was a shell without a kernel," and on June 29 "he gave me the grant of the bishopric of S. David's." He was consecrated on November 18.[1]

The bishopric of S. David's was not a very appropriate see for an Englishman already much occupied with affairs of State, and it was some time before the conclusion of Parliament[2] allowed Laud to visit his diocese. The King evidently wished to keep him in England: he gave him leave to retain the headship of S. John's, but Laud would on no account violate the college statutes, and resigned the Presidentship shortly after his consecration.[3]

On October 10, 1621, he was elected by the chapter of S. David's, and on December 30 he was installed, Dr. Robert Rudd, Archdeacon of S. David's, being his proxy.[4] On the 5th of the following July Laud "first entered into Wales," and four days later began his first visitation at Brecon. Thence he went to S. David's, where the register shows him to have been present on July 22. His first meeting with his chapter was characteristic. "Whereas," runs the record, "the Reverend Father in God, William Laud, Bishop of S. David's, hath taken offence that the muniments of the said church are in such shameful confusion and so much

[1] The consecrators were the Bishops of London, Worcester, Chichester, Ely, Llandaff, and Oxford, Archbishop Abbot being then under suspension for the accidental homicide of a keeper.

[2] Heylin, *Cypr. Anglic.*, p. 93.

[3] Diary, *Works*, iii. 136-7.

[4] Register of S. David's Cath. *Reg. Men. D.*, pp. 1—3.

neglected, he hath, with the consent of the precentor[1] and chapter, ordered and decreed as follows—viz. that all and singular instruments, deeds," &c., be transcribed and kept in safe custody by the chapter clerk. This very necessary order is signed in the bold handwriting of "Guill. Meneven." In the same meeting the chapter deposed the school-master, as "being insufficient for the place," allowing him his stipend for a time, "that he might in that space provide otherwise for himself." Laud was accompanied by his nephew, Richard Baylie, whom he nominated chancellor of the cathedral. On the same day as the visitation of the chapter he was personally installed.[2]

Laud returned to England on August 15. He did not return to his diocese till 1625. He did not, however, remit his care, but kept as close a watch on his see as was possible for a non-resident bishop. In inquiry for recusants, as well as in spiritual direction, the State Papers show him to have been active. When he returned in August 1625, he found the chapel which he had built in the house at Abergwili ready for consecration. The palace appears to have needed considerable restoration. Bishop Ferrar, who had the singular ill-fortune to be imprisoned by Edward VI. and burnt by Mary, excused himself for not performing

[1] At S. David's, where the bishop had originally been dean, the precentor up to 1840 was head of the chapter. Since that date the precentor has assumed, by 3 & 4 Vict., c. 113, the title of dean. I need hardly mention, as the great classic on all that concerns S. David's, the monumental work of the present bishop and the late Mr. Freeman.

[2] By the kindness of the venerable Dean of S. David's, I have been allowed to inspect the chapter register, the valuable *Collectanea Menevensia* of Canon Payne, and the interesting note-books of Archdeacon Yardley.

the episcopal duty of hospitality by declaring the ruinous condition of the hall. The house was repaired by later bishops, and Laud's chapel is on the floor over the present library. It seems probable that the hall Bishop Ferrar speaks of was divided into two rooms on the ground floor, while its height would admit of the creation of an upper floor, on which are the chapel and the present drawing-room. Laud's own buildings are so few that the chapel at Abergwili deserves special notice. It is in size and arrangement very like the chapel of a small college. Re-decorated by the present bishop and his predecessor, it still shows clear indications of its appearance when Laud finished it. Its unusual position adds considerably to its interest, and its continuous use for the most sacred purposes gives it a special claim to the reverence of those who respect its founder. It was consecrated on Sunday, August 28, 1625, which Laud notes in his Diary as being the eve of the Decollation of S. John Baptist, a day appropriate from its association with his beloved college, and recalling to his mind the King's hearing of the question of his election to the Presidentship fourteen years before.[1]

The act of consecration was charged against him as a crime at his trial, and the charge was reinforced by the discovery of the list of furniture in Bishop Andrewes' chapel, which Prynne declared to be Laud's.[2] He gave valuable plate to the chapel, "rich furniture and costly utensils and whatsoever else was necessary or convenient for the service of God," says Heylin, and the sacred vessels alone, he adds, cost £155 18*s.* 4*d.* It does not

[1] See Diary, *Works*, iii. 171-2. The instrument of consecration is in Prynne, *Canterburie's Doome*, pp. 120, 121.

[2] See *Canterburie's Doome*, pp. 121-4, and Laud's *Works*, iv. 251.

appear, however, that the chapel was completed, or if it was it suffered considerably during the civil wars, for Bishop Lucy,[1] writing in 1670, speaks of his own work in it. "The chapel," he writes, "is not yet finished, but I have given orders for it, and I have acquainted Dr. Thomas that if I finish it not in my life, I have left £100 in my will for the completing of it with seats and plate, which I know will make it more decent than ever it was."

Laud did not stay long at Abergwili, yet the beauty of the place and the pleasant old manor-house looking across the broad river to the wood-covered hills must have given him days of happy quiet. We can trace his journeys from his Diary, where he tells of his carriage breaking down between Aber-marlies (Abermarlais probably, not many miles away, on the hills) and his house, and of his ride into the mountains on a bright October day, when he and his company dined with his registrary at his country farm of "Pente Cragg," a mile from the palace, whence a beautiful mountain view can be seen. On November 11 he left Wales. In the following June he was given the bishopric of Bath and Wells.

His episcopate cannot be said to have left much mark on the Welsh Church. He seems only to have held two ordinations: and on another occasion "only one person desired to receive holy orders . . . and he found to be unfit, upon examination." The unhappy man was "sent away with an exhortation." His tenure of a Welsh see served merely to increase his knowledge

[1] Letter to Archbishop of Canterbury, dated Brecon, October 10, 1670. I have to thank the Lord Bishop of S. David's for allowing me to inspect his muniments, among which I found a copy of this letter.

of the needs of the outlying districts and his determination to supply them. But his short stay at beautiful Abergwili was not forgotten; he remembered the poor of that little village in his will.[1]

It was during his tenure of the see of S. David's that Laud came into close association with Buckingham, and that friendship began which will be spoken of later. He was constantly at Court, preaching and in conversation with James and Charles, both of whom were present at his conference with the Jesuit Fisher. The King was pleased to be consulted on theological matters; they discussed a French Capuchin's book as to the Real Presence, and Laud read over to him his answer to Fisher before it appeared in print. A month later the King gave him the living of Crick, in Northamptonshire. But it is clear that he was not as yet admitted to the inner secrets of the Court, for he did not know of the Spanish journey until the Prince and the Duke had started, though he corresponded constantly with Buckingham during his absence.

Early in 1622 he received what seems to have been his first political employment when he was "put into the Commission of Grievances," appointed on the dissolution of Parliament after the famous protest of privileges. Very soon after he found that the Lord-Keeper, Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, regarded him with no favour. Williams was a capable man, somewhat too supple in his principles, and eager for political advancement. As Lord-Keeper, he had earned high praise from lawyers as well as the public, though he was the successor of Bacon. When he had been appointed to the see of Lincoln

[1] Canon Bevan's *Diocesan History of S. David's* contains a brief account of Laud's episcopate.

it was expected that his deanery of Westminster would be given to Laud. Hacket's account of the circumstances, in his Life of Williams, derived though it be from the Bishop's own information, is clearly erroneous:[1] though it may be that Williams would rather that Laud had S. David's than Westminster, which he retained himself with his bishopric and his legal work. Whatever may be the truth of the matter, it is evident that the divergence between Laud and Williams was not yet openly revealed, though Laud thought it necessary to speak of it to Buckingham.[2]

That Williams intrigued against Buckingham is the assertion of Heylin. However that may be, the Duke returned from Spain as Laud's friend and the enemy of Williams. The history of the quarrel is a tangled one, and scarce worth elucidation. It is of more interest to observe how Laud regarded it in his private thoughts. "It was Sunday. I was alone, and languishing with I know not what sadness. I was much concerned at the envy and undeserved hatred borne to me by the Lord Keeper. I took into my hands the Greek Testament, that I might read the portion of the day. I lighted upon the thirteenth chapter to the Hebrews, wherein that of David, Psalm lvi., occurred to me then grieving and fearing: 'The Lord is my helper: I will not fear what man can do unto me.' I thought an example was set me; and who is not safe under that shield? Protect me, O my God."[3]

[1] Internal evidence is quite enough to condemn the story. I am glad to have the support of 'A Romish Recusant' on this point, p. 68 *sqq*.

[2] Diary, October 31, 1623.

[3] The original entry is in Latin. Wharton appended the translation. The date is January 25, 1623-4.

It is difficult to believe that a man who would write thus in his Diary, could be guilty of such ingratitude to a benefactor as Hacket's account would imply.

Meanwhile Laud was being gradually introduced into political business, and his energy and decision of character were becoming known. To this period belongs his first record of a conversation with Prince Charles, upon whom he was afterwards to exercise so profound an influence. "I stood by him at supper, where he was a merry talker, and spoke of many things by the way."[1] One of these "obiter dicta" was his remark, that he could never be a lawyer. "I cannot defend a bad cause, nor yield in a good one." His friendship with Buckingham continued, and he was able to exercise some influence over him in Church matters, by no means always to Abbot's satisfaction.[2] He was appointed to consider a proposal of Buckingham's for the diversion of part of Sutton's endowments from the Charterhouse for the support of the army: he rejected the proposal in a very clear memorandum, still preserved at Lambeth,[3] in which, with characteristic reverence for antiquity and charitable bequest, he refused to admit the argument that the present abuse justified a departure from the founder's will. "It is the greatest work that hath been done since the Reformation of religion. Will not therefore the dissolving of it be a great scandal to this State and Church, and give the Roman party just occasion to triumph? Will it not be a great disheartening to all charitable

[1] "Multa obiter cum suis." Feb. 1, 1623-4.

[2] Cf. Diary, March 27 and 29, 1624.

[3] Printed in *Works*, vi. 1 *sqq.* 'Old Carthusians' may well be grateful to Laud for preserving their foundation from Buckingham's clutches.

men to see such works dissolved in the very age that brought them forth?"

In his work on charities, largely secular, but undertaken certainly in an ecclesiastical spirit, Laud was engaged till the death of James I. On March 27, 1625, Mid-Lent Sunday, as Laud was preaching at Whitehall, the news was spread that the King had breathed his last, and he broke off his sermon in the midst, interrupted by the sobs of Buckingham. Of the King's last hours Laud had every means of knowing through his old friend and the King's physician, Sir William Paddy, and he writes that he made a brave and most religious end.[1]

Through Buckingham, over whose fickle mind he had established a strong religious influence, Laud was from the first able to approach the new King with much greater freedom than he could use towards his father. Within a week of James's death Charles singled out Laud for special favour by bidding him preach at the opening of Parliament; four days later he drew up for Buckingham to give to the King a list of prominent ecclesiastics marked with the letters O and P. It was clear that the new King intended to be orthodox, and to show no favour to the Puritan party. From the first there was a party against him: he was already named to the King as "popishly affected." Puritan fears might seem to receive some countenance when for the first time since the days of Mary an English sovereign was united in marriage to a Romanist. From the very

[1] Diary. Cf. Bp. Williams' sermon, "Great Britain's Salomon," p. 68 *sqq.*, and Sir William Paddy's MS. account inserted in the King's Prayer-Book, and preserved in the library of S. John's College. It is on the King's last hours too that Laud chiefly dwells in his *Memorables of King James* (*Works*, vi. 5—7).

first coming of Henrietta Maria public suspicion must have been awake. But Laud welcomed her only with the prayer, "God grant that she may be a happy star to our orb."

The sermon that he was to have preached at the opening of Parliament was delivered, after the adjournment, next day at Whitehall. It was on Ps. lxxv. 2, 3, "When I shall receive the congregation I will judge according unto right,"—a stalwart "Church and King" discourse. The Church is the State's support; together they stand or fall. "It is not possible in any Christian commonwealth that the Church should 'melt' and the State stand firm. For there can be no firmness without law, and no laws can be binding if there be no conscience to obey them; penalty alone could never, can never, do it. And no school can teach conscience but the Church of Christ." Such was to be the motto of the new reign, and it was fit therefore that Laud should be one of those chosen to arrange the ceremonies of the coronation.[1] He was therefore doubly concerned, for he was still a prebendary of Westminster.

More than this, on January 16, scarcely a fortnight before the coronation, he was appointed to act as deputy to the Dean (his enemy, Bishop Williams, now in disgrace). In this capacity he had important duties to perform. The greater part of the preparation within the Abbey was left entirely in his hands, and it was his part to remind the King to devote the eve of his coronation to prayer and meditation, a duty which he did not neglect. That the details of the coronation were admirably carried out we have clear evidence.

[1] *The Manner of the Coronation of King Charles I.*, edited by Chr. Wordsworth, M.A. (Henry Bradshaw Society), is invaluable on all that concerns the coronation. See also Laud's *Works*.

Laud's neatness and accuracy were well employed. "The ceremony was performed without any interruption and in very good order:"[1] and "it was one of the most punctual coronations since the Conquest."[2]

A special interest belongs to the coronation, from the fact that the form used for the coronation of James I. had been hastily compiled, all earlier coronations having been in Latin, and the Archbishop and a committee of bishops revised the service for the occasion. The book thus drawn up has not since then been substantially varied. It is not, however, to be regarded as especially the work of Laud. He himself denied being in any way chiefly responsible for its compilation, and beyond the fact of his known interest in liturgiology, and the existence of copies of the book annotated by himself, there is nothing to identify his hand in it. It is throughout according to the ancient sources.

Laud's special part in the coronation lay in the ordering of details. At the Communion of the King he administered the chalice, and when the King had left the Abbey, he returned to the altar and "offered up the three swords solemnly at the altar, ad perpetuum usum Regni et honorem Regni et Ecclesiæ." These and other points were charged against him at his trial: his answer was throughout an appeal to precedent.

It is clear that so soon as Laud came to be intimately known to the King his influence would make itself felt. It was first seen in the case of Mountague. Richard Mountague, Rector of Stanford Rivers, was a scholar of great learning and a writer of sharp, trenchant

[1] MS. note in Laud's own copy of coronation service.
[2] Ellis, *Original Letters*, iii. no. 323.

English. He had come before the public in consequence of an anti-Roman controversy which had originated in his own parish, and in which he had endeavoured to answer his opponents after their own method. A Roman writer had endeavoured to discredit the theology of the English Church by confusing it, after a fashion not unfamiliar, with Calvinism, in a pamphlet called *A Gag for the New Gospel*. Mountague retorted with *A New Gag for an Old Goose*. The Roman controversialist had produced forty-seven propositions which he attributed to the Church of England. Of these Mountague allowed only eight to be her true doctrine. The rest he declared to be either undecided or condemned by her; while some are "raked together out of the laystalls of the deepest puritanism." The aim of Mountague's writing was one with which moderate men would sympathize: "An impartial judgment," it has been said by the highest living authority, "will probably consider it as a temperate exposition of the reasons which were leading an increasing body of scholars to reject the doctrines of Rome and of Geneva alike."[1] Had its theological position been expressed in the usual language of theologians, it would scarce have aroused even a theological tempest. But its sting lay in the popularity, if not vulgarity, of the diction. Mountague descended from the rostrum, like Wyclif, to enter the arena. In a few weeks all was dust and confusion. A Puritan House of Commons could neither tolerate nor ignore an attack which seemed so flagrant and so flippant. And the storm was by no means calmed by Mountague's publication of a treatise on the Invocation of Saints, and of another popular anti-

[1] Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. v., p. 352.

Puritan pamphlet, *Appello Caesarem*. During the last year of his life James had declined to censure Mountague's earlier writings. "If that is to be a papist," he said, "so am I a papist." The *Appello Caesarem* had been referred by James within a month of his death to Dr. White, Dean of Carlisle, Laud's companion in the controversy with Fisher, who found "nothing therein but what is agreeable to the public faith, doctrine, and discipline established in the Church of England;" and Laud, with Buckeridge and Howson, had written to ask Buckingham's support when Mountague was attacked by the Commons.

Charles, with his usual rashness, at the very crisis of the Commons' onslaught, made Mountague his chaplain, and declared that he would protect him. The Commons did not desist. The King appointed a commission of bishops to report on Mountague's opinion. Montaigne, Neile, Andrewes, Buckeridge, and Laud—no bad judges—decided in his favour. Then a conference—after the manner of Laud's own conference with Fisher—was held; but it convinced no one. Eventually Mountague was made Bishop of Chichester in the teeth of the Commons' denunciations. In all this Laud had played a prominent part. He had convinced himself that the claim of the English Church to speak with the voice of historic theology was concerned in Mountague's case, and he threw himself, without a thought of the consequences, into the strife. This, his first active intervention in the very centre of the ecclesiastical contests of the day, and his first open conflict with the Puritans in the Commons, is characteristic of his whole life. Tolerant by conviction, and claiming wide liberty for others in the interpretation of the Anglican formularies, he yet could

conceive of no sound foundation but what was built upon the historic Christianity of the Church. To preserve that he would sacrifice anything: and in none of the battles in which he was afterwards to be engaged did he count the cost, or consider for one moment the personal unpopularity which would attach to himself. As soon as he had decided upon the right course, the question of his conduct was for him unalterably settled. Thus he managed to divert upon his own head much of the wrath originally intended for those whose cause he chivalrously espoused. But the further Laud was estranged from the Puritan Commons the nearer he was drawn to the King. Constantly, as his Diary shows, in Buckingham's house, he became gradually introduced into the inner circle of government. He was set to consider of the religious aspect of the strange project of one Oventrout, who "proposed to show a way how the West Indies might shake off the yoke of Spain, and put themselves under the subjection of our King Charles." His record of the affair ends quaintly. "We dismissed the man, and returned not a whit the wiser."

That his influence was at work with the King is clear from the constant references that we now find made to religious questions. The Court as well as the Commons was keenly alive to theological interests. Was Bishop Goodman of Gloucester teaching Roman doctrine? Abbot, Neile, Andrewes, and Laud were to consider. Even the excitement of the impeachment of Buckingham did not diminish the attention paid to Church matters. The King chid the bishops "that in this time of Parliament we were silent in the cause of the Church, and did not make known to him what might be useful, or was prejudicial to the Church, professing himself

ready to promote the cause of the Church." In the midst of all the domestic troubles and the foreign dangers, Charles promoted Laud to the bishopric of Bath and Wells.[1] On the death of Andrewes two months later, Laud became Dean of the Chapel Royal. In this office he came still nearer to the King. It was his part to order the services in the royal chapels, and there within a very short time Laud worked an important reformation. It had been the custom since James I. came to the throne, to cut off the prayers whenever the King entered the chapel, and proceed at once to anthem and sermon. "I desired his Majesty," says the Diary, "that he would please to be present at prayers[2] as well as sermon every Sunday, and that at whatsoever part of the prayers he came, the priest then officiating might proceed to the end of the prayers. The most religious King not only assented, but also gave me thanks."

From this date we may still more certainly assume that the religious policy of Charles was practically dictated by Laud. Thus it was agreed, contrary to Williams's advice, that Bishop Andrewes' letters to Du Moulin, "concerning bishops that they are jure divino," should be published—as they were in 1629 by Buckeridge and Laud. Thus it was that Sibthorp's sermon, revised it is true, was published, containing the strongest statements of the Divine right of kings, in spite of Abbot's protest that it contained statements contrary to the laws of the realm. Thus it was that Manwaring, whom Parliament censured, received from the Crown

[1] *Congé d'élire*, July 20, 1626; August 16, election; Sept. 18, confirmation; Sept. 19, Laud did homage (Wells Cath. MSS. and Laud's Diary).

[2] *Lyturgiae.* Is Laud speaking of the Holy Communion?

both pardon and promotion. Thus it was that Williams remained in disgrace, and that Abbot himself was sequestered from office. In politics Laud stood by the King's side. He wrote the speeches which Charles delivered on behalf of Buckingham, and corrected Buckingham's own defence. And Laud himself became Bishop of London at the very time when the outcry against him in the Commons was loudest. Yet he remained unconscious of the feeling which was excited; of the discussion in the Lords he wrote, "By God's goodness towards me I was fully cleared in the House." On July 15, 1628, he was translated to London. On August 23 Buckingham was assassinated. The news reached Laud the next day as he was consecrating Mountague to the bishopric of Chichester.

From the death of Buckingham Laud stood almost alone. His friendship with Strafford was kept up almost entirely by letters. At Court he had no one with whom he was entirely intimate, and self-contained though he was, he felt the need of support. Two years later he was able to secure the appointment of his old friend Windebanke, with whom he had so often stayed at Haines Hill, to be Secretary of State, and a month later, "Juxon was at my suit sworn Clerk of his Majesty's Closet, that I might have one that I might trust near his Majesty if I grow weak and infirm."

During the five years in which Laud remained Bishop of London he was engaged to the full in political business; but he was able also more thoroughly to devote himself to his ecclesiastical charge. To this period also belongs much of his work on behalf of the University of Oxford.

In politics he scanned closely the action of the House

of Commons. A copy of Rudyerd's famous speech calling for the republication of Magna Carta, exists in the Record Office, in the writing of Bishop Harsnet, annotated by Laud.[1] There also may be seen a list of eight Bills which the Parliament of 1628, according to Laud, intended to pass "against the Church."[2] His own political theories and political action are worthy of separate consideration. The greater part of his ecclesiastical policy may also more fitly be considered later. This much, however, may be said here. He was now able to carry out the greater part of the aims which he had long had at heart. There can be no doubt that the closest of these to his heart was the reformation of the Church. The clergy of his new diocese urged him to begin from below.[3] But he was never afraid of striking at high game. Through his influence, no doubt—for the draft letter exists in Laud's writing[4]—Charles ordered Abbot to command all the bishops to retire to their sees, "those only excepted whose attendance at Court is necessarily required." Thereby it was intended to avoid the "ill example" to "the inferior clergymen, and the hindrance of God's service and the King's." Laud had himself not spent much time in his dioceses; but he had the excuse of Court business, and he had certainly done as much by a month's residence as most of the other bishops in a year.

In 1633 he went with the King to Scotland, and came still nearer to his most intimate designs. He had long been Primate in all but name: as early as 1626

[1] *Cal. State Papers,* 1628-9, p. 92.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 129.
[3] *Ibid.*, 1629, Nov. 17.
[4] *Ibid.*, 1629, May 13.

Buckingham had told him of the King's intentions for the next vacancy. Abbot died on August 4, 1633, and on the 6th Charles greeted the Bishop of London with the words, "My Lord's Grace of Canterbury, you are very welcome."

CHAPTER II.

PRIVATE LIFE AND FRIENDS.

LAUD'S public life seems to overpower and dwarf his personal history. We know little of how he lived in his own house, or of what were his deepest intimacies. It is difficult to imagine him at home, in his study or his garden, in any of his dwellings which still remain. At Oxford his own work transformed his college completely from the appearance it must have borne when he was a resident, nor is there any record of the room in which he lived. Book-cases known to have been his still remain, but they belong to a date after he had left Oxford. At Gloucester, or Wells, or Fulham, as well as at Croydon, there are other memories to dispute the ground with his. Abergwili is much altered: Lambeth is changed beyond recognition; the Lollard's Tower and the gateway stand incongruously by the side of the modern building, and the chapel would not be known for the place which Prynne and the accusers so keenly scrutinized. His picture, the shell of his tortoise, books and papers that were his, preserve his memory; but a modern student is brought most near to Laud in the library, among the official records of his primacy, or

the faded letters which he so carefully endorsed and preserved.

His person in his habit as he lived it is not hard to recall. The two busts at S. John's,[1] made in 1633, both probably the work of Hubert le Sueur, the almost innumerable portraits, attributed with more or less rashness to Vandyke, the medal struck to commemorate his martyrdom,[2] the miniatures and engravings, the rough cuts that adorn the countless libels against him, enable us to draw a clear picture of his appearance. He was short and strongly built, but thin except in the face, which was plump and rosy to the day of his death. A trim pointed beard and moustache, bright peering eyes, heavy eyebrows, close-cropt white hair, give a marked individuality to the portraits. Alertness and determination seem the chief characteristics, and a cheery optimism that delights to plan and has confidence in the present. He looks, as his life shows him to have been, active, inquiring, assimilative, not original, but of a strength and impressiveness which originality often lacks. Certainly the face is kindly, and as certainly it is full of intellectual keenness. It would arrest attention anywhere, but it would not compel admiration, perhaps hardly solicit friendship.[3]

[1] One is in the President's lodging, one in the library.

[2] See below, p. 227.

[3] The portraits of Laud are very numerous. The three best known are the fine portraits in S. John's College Library, at Lambeth, and in the Hermitage Gallery, S. Petersburg. The last was at one time the property of Sir Robert Walpole, and was engraved while it was at Houghton. It was sold to Catherine II. of Russia. The Lambeth portrait was unquestionably there in Laud's own day, and one of the S. John's pictures is also most probably authentic. Another, probably referred to in a letter to Strafford, is not by Vandyke (*Works*, vii. 295). The S. Petersburg portrait has perhaps the best claim to be considered entirely

Yet after all Laud was certainly a homely man. His letters show him full of jest and quaintness. He likes Yorkshire beef and "hung venison"; he is grateful for a present of dried fish; he thanks Strafford for the marten's fur, which will keep him warm in winter; he hopes that a lady who sends him a cat "does not mean to scratch her friends by such tokens." When he felt at ease with a friend he spoke freely. We may wonder what the staid officials of the Court would have thought had they known how merrily the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lord-Deputy of Ireland were writing about them—about the idleness and self-seeking of the ministers, of Cottington's iniquities and the Archbishop of Cashel's "sciatica in the conscience." For a busy man,—and few modern officials have more work than Laud had,—he writes very naturally and freely; and, weary though he often was, he never made his labours an excuse for neglecting an act of kindness. Work, however, seems to have told upon his health and his temper. He was a sickly infant, and a weak and ailing lad at Oxford; and when he grew older he was constantly ill. He twice broke a sinew of his right leg, and was laid up for a long time. He was easily made

---

the work of Vandyke, but the others, and many more that are to be found in colleges, private houses, and palaces or institutions with which Laud was connected, have some touches that suggest the hand of the great master. There are a great number of copies; almost all retain the attitude and style of the famous pictures. The Bishop of S. David's has an interesting portrait at Abergwili, which differs somewhat from those better known.

Among the engravings Hollar's print is the best. The libels are often curious but recognizable distortions. The rare portrait "with the Chain," a rough, vulgar sketch, is mentioned by Laud himself. "The Recantation of the Prelate of Canterbury" (1641) contains a not unpleasing portrait representing Laud probably in his ordinary house dress, a cassock, ruff and skull-cap. (See p. 192, note.)

ill, and yet his constitution was capable of great endurance. As an old man his physical strength amid all the anxieties of his imprisonment and his trial was amazing. His bold heart and strong nerve carried him through times of stress which would have broken down robuster men. Like most students and sedentary men of business, he made occasional and spasmodic efforts to take exercise. When he was detained indoors he would "swing a book for exercise," and so injudiciously as to strain himself seriously. He would walk for hours in the garden at Lambeth, and often transact his business the while. At his trial he did not deny that he played bowls, though he did disclaim that he played them like Calvin on Sunday. He would ride too on occasion. Newcastle, master in the art of equitation, gave him "a fine great horse," and Strafford a "Dutch pad," a saddle so rich that he thought a bishop should not in "this age" use it.

Weak health in a busy man naturally shows itself in a hasty or querulous temper. Laud unquestionably was passionate in retort, and easily irritated by triflers and busybodies. Whatever be the true story of his quarrel with Archie Armstrong, the King's fool, it shows that when weighty anxieties pressed upon him he would not stay to treat folly gently.[1] Many of the complaints of his action in the Star Chamber or High Commission were due to his hasty vehemence of language. Much that was charged against him was exaggerated no doubt; but an archbishop should not even seem to lose his temper in a public place.

[1] The facts are best put in Mr. Reynolds's edition of *Selden's Table Talk*, p. 62. 'A Romish Recusant' repeats the story in the form which tells most against Laud.

When a troublesome minister named Culmer, a man of no very dignified or pleasant character, came troubling him with questions for consideration, he was said to have replied, "Consideration—I'll take nothing into consideration; and if you conform not all the sooner, I'll take a more round course with you."[1] Clarendon admits his "unpopular natural infirmities," the "greatest of which," he says, "was (besides a hasty, sharp way of expressing himself) that he believed innocence of heart and integrity of manners was a guard strong enough to secure any man in his voyage through this world." He was, in fact, an honest man himself, and was intolerant to rudeness of anything that did not seem straightforward in those with whom he had to deal. That Heylin repeats much criticism may be taken to prove at least the sharpness of his manner. The roughness of his uncourtly nature, the small command he had of his passion, his neglect of civility to the nobility, his dislike of all ostentation and show—all these told against him in an age and a Court where forms were so greatly regarded. He lived a lonely life. He had no wife or near kin with him to calm his humours and minister to his weariness. No intimate friend ever lived in his house. He had but little time for quiet converse, and few, if any, who would give him advice. When it was given he was grateful for it, with a sort of half-satirical pathos of self-condemnation, which appears in Clarendon's account of an occasion when he was made to hear home-truths. Young Mr. Hyde, always well-meaning if a little officious, thought it would be well that the Archbishop should hear what men said of him, and took upon himself to tutor the Primate.

[1] Deposition of Culmer, *Cal. Stat. Pap., Dom.*, 1643-4, p. 15.

"He found the Archbishop"[1]—the passage is so characteristic and so illuminative that it may well be quoted here—"early walking in the garden, who received him very graciously, and continuing his walk, asked him, 'What good news in the country?' to which he answered, 'there was none good; the people were universally discontented, and (which troubled him most) that many people spoke extreme ill of his Grace, as the cause of all that was amiss.' He replied, 'that he was sorry for it: he knew he did not deserve it; and that he must not give over serving the King and the Church to please the people, who otherwise would not speak well of him.' Mr. Hyde told him, 'he thought he need not lessen his zeal for either; and that it grieved him to find persons of the best condition, and who loved both King and Church, exceedingly indevoted to him, complaining of his manner of treating them when they had occasion to resort to him, it may be for his directions.' And then named him two persons of the most interest and credit in Wiltshire, who had that summer attended the Council Board in some affairs which concerned the King and the country; that all the Lords present used them with great courtesy, knowing well their quality and reputation, but that he alone spake very sharply to them, and without anything of grace, at which they were much troubled; and one of them, supposing that somebody had done him ill offices, went the next morning to Lambeth, to present his service to him, and to discover if he could what misrepresentation had been made of him: that after he had attended very long, he was admitted to speak with his Grace, who, scarce hearing him, sharply answered him, that 'he had

[1] *Clarendon's Life*, Oxford, 1759, vol. i., p. 62 *sqq.*

no leisure for compliments,' and so hurried away; which put the other gentleman much out of countenance. And that this kind of behaviour of his was the discourse of all companies of persons of quality, every man continuing any such story with another like it, very much to his disadvantage, and to the trouble of those who were very just to him."

These were home-truths indeed, but Laud was very humble under the criticism; he "heard the relation very patiently, and discoursed over every particular with all manner of condescension, and said, with evident show of trouble, that 'he was very unfortunate to be so ill understood; that he meant very well; that he remembered the time when those two persons were with the Council; that upon any deliberations, when anything was resolved, or to be said to anybody, the Council enjoined him to deliver their resolutions, which he did always according to the best of his understanding; but of the imperfection he had by nature, which he said often troubled him, he might deliver it in such a tune, and with a sharpness of voice, that made men believe he was angry, when there was no such thing; that when those gentlemen were there, and he had delivered what he was to say, they made some stay, and spake with some of the Lords, which not being according to order, he thought he gave them some reprehension, they having at that time very much other business to do; that he did very well remember, that one of them (who was a person of honour) came afterwards to him, at a time he was shut up about an affair of importance which required his full thoughts, but that as soon as he heard of the other's being without, he sent for him, himself going into the next room, and

received him very kindly, as he thought; and supposing that he came about business, asked him what his business was; and the other answering that he had no business, but continuing his address with some ceremony, he had indeed said that he had not time for compliments; but he did not think that he went out of the room in that manner; and concluded that it was not possible for him in the many occupations he had to spend any time in unnecessary compliments; and that if his integrity and uprightness, which never should be liable to reproach, could not be strong enough to preserve him, he must submit to God's pleasure." When Hyde pressed him further he answered with a smile, that "he could only answer for his heart, that he had very good meaning; for his tongue, he could not undertake that he would not sometimes speak more hastily and sharply than he should do (which oftentimes he was sorry and reprehended himself for), and in a time which might be liable to misinterpretation, with them who were not very well acquainted with him, and so knew that it was an infirmity which his nature and education had so rooted in him that it was in vain to contend with it."

Heylin's description well harmonizes with Clarendon's, but it is more intimate and more enthusiastic. "Of apprehension he was quick and sudden, of a very sociable wit and a pleasant humour; and one that knew as well how to put off the gravity of his place and person when he saw occasion, as any man living; accessible enough at all times, but when he was tired out with multiplicity and vexation of business, which some, who did not understand him, ascribed unto the natural ruggedness of his disposition . . . constant not

only to the public prayers in his chapel, but to his private devotions in his closet."[1] He was a busy man, with little time for recreation. His rest and refreshment was in the fixed hours of prayer; then alone could he not be intruded upon; there, in his chapel, he could renew his strength and his patience.

Yet with all this business and this devotion he was as little an ascetic as he was a worldling. He lived by rule, but by rule which became an enthusiasm. He obeyed the English Church implicitly: his greatest wish was fully to observe her rules. And this became a delight. He loved, one might say, every stone of the ancient fabric. He was not at all a mystic, but he was a truly pious man, to whom the language of the Bible, of the ancient collects and the English service-books, and the intimate thoughts of private prayer, were the very breath of life.

This only could preserve him in a Court so full of selfishness and deceit. He had indeed to go warily, though he never ceased to walk boldly. There was no reliance to be placed anywhere, certainly not upon the King. "But then I have nothing but the King's word to me; and should he forget or deny it, where is my remedy?"[2] The Queen with her Roman intrigues was a constant difficulty—"a cunning and practising woman" the Archbishop did not hesitate to call her. A life of extreme simplicity, and with fixed times of work and devotion—this was his safeguard in a Court society which might ensnare even where it could not attract.

Often, one may think, his only relief, after a weary day of labour and contention, was to sit down and write

[1] *Cyprianus Anglicus*, p. 542.
[2] To Strafford, Jan 23, 1636. Laud's *Works*, vii. 211.

the long record of his troubles to the only friend who could truly share them. "I am very weary," he would say to Strafford, and "I have had all manner of provocations put upon me."

That such a man, so restless by nature and by necessity, should dream often and strangely is not wonderful. May it not have been some quaint humour which made him jot down the curious visions that came to him as he slept? They do not read seriously. There is nothing to show that he seriously regarded them when he came to act. If there was superstition in recording them, it was the gentle superstition which children learn traditionally from their kinsfolk. "They have," thought Carlyle, "an affectionate, lovable kind of character." They touch indeed every side of his thoughts—the humours of a Court, the grim and gloomy outlook of the times, political difficulties, the love of friends, the Christian solace that was nearest to his heart—"my dream of my Blessed Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. One of the most comfortable passages that ever I had in my life."

It is a poor criticism indeed that must find its evidence in a private diary and its sharpest satires in the world of dreams. Laud was a busy, weary man: when he slept his troubles did not desert him; when he woke, in those few idle moments when he could find time to write,[1] he put down the quaint remembrances in which the night gave some relief to the day's continued toil.

The personal interests of a man so busy were naturally simple. He loved his garden, and his birds, and his music: he did not care for state or dignity or pomp.

[1] The Diary was very irregularly kept, and very briefly.

"I'll tell you a pretty story by the bye," he writes to Strafford, "and 'tis true. When I first came to Lambeth, there were in the walks song-thrushes, which ever began to sing in February, and so continued, and the nightingales followed in their season. Both of these came my first year, I think to take their leave, for neither of them hath appeared ever since." [1] His visitation articles and his particular directions to cathedrals show a knowledge of church music and its requirements which could not have been second-hand. His will mentions instruments that he had at Lambeth and at Croydon, his harp and chest of viols, and "the harpsico in the parlour at Lambeth."

But his chiefest interests were undoubtedly those of a scholar. He was always a book-lover. Rare editions, unique manuscripts, rich bindings—the delights of the bibliophile—his own collections as well as his literary remains show him to have been keenly interested in. At the time of Charles's coronation, his old friend Bishop Neile, who had always found him a lodging, had to give up his house to the French Ambassador; the Diary records the care with which he himself arranged his books in their new home. His letters contain constant reference to the purchase of rare books. He made ambassadors and merchants collectors for him; but with an unselfishness rare among virtuosos, he gave his choicest treasures—it would seem from his will almost all he had, though he still had many liturgies, which, it would seem, were his favourite study—while he still lived to public libraries and private friends. He had a taste for art. He could talk of Vandyke with the King and Strafford: he knew the value of pictures and of medals.

[1] *Works*, vii. 416.

He had indeed many of the characteristics of the great prelates of the Renaissance, with just that change which its ideas underwent on English soil. He was a great builder and a patron of art, a scholar and a politician, a priest with a love of comely order and the seemly dignities of public worship. He delighted to read and to control the literature of the day: he would accept dedications and encourage struggling writers. There was a certain formality about it all, viewed from without, a sort of sober stateliness of pose such as the Italian painters give to their church ceremonials and the backgrounds of their cardinals. But with Laud there was a more than English impatience at any ceremonial that was meaningless, and there was, behind all, the deep piety that let no touch of paganism from scholarship or art enter into the scheme of his life.

Such was Laud as we know him in himself. We may learn something more from his association with those who came nearest to his heart. His deepest friendships were with the two most prominent politicians among his contemporaries in the service of the Crown. Minute investigation, which has done so much to rehabilitate the character of maligned ministers, has done little if anything to raise the reputation of George Villiers. Rash, violent, and constantly swayed by the swift currents of his passions and his sympathies, Buckingham was perhaps the least fitted to guide the policy of a great nation of all those who have ever been kings' friends. His personal defects were no less obvious than his public deficiencies. But at the same time it is impossible to deny that the extraordinary fascination which he exercised over some of the worthiest as well as the greatest of his contemporaries was due

to his possession of qualities which naturally and rightly inspired the love and admiration of those who knew him. He was a warm-hearted, generous man, who sinned in hot blood, but repented with tears—"good-hearted," as men say, and full of buoyant youthfulness. His contemporaries, with all their adulation of his power and position, yet felt for him always as sober men feel for a gallant boy called upon to perform great tasks. They were tolerant of his errors, they recognized his difficulties, they watched his career with sympathetic interest and almost involuntary admiration.

Such as these were the feelings with which Laud regarded him. They first came together on religious questions. April 23, 1622, "the King sent for me," says Laud's Diary, "and set me into a course about the Countess of Buckingham, who about that time was wavering in point of religion." On May 10 the young Marquis spoke to him of his own religious difficulties, and ten days later Laud gave him "papers concerning the difference between the Church of England and Rome in point of salvation, etc." Buckingham was present at the conference with Fisher, which drew him nearer to Laud as it confirmed him in the English Church. On Whit Sunday they had intimate talk together—"the particulars are not for paper."[1] On the eve of Trinity Sunday the favourite made his confession to the Bishop, and next day he received the Blessed Sacrament. On January 11 of the next year Laud's Diary has—"My Lord of Buckingham and I in the inner chamber at York House. QUOD BEET SALVATOR NOSTER CHRISTUS JESUS."

[1] "June 15, I became C. to my Lord of Buckingham." There can be no doubt this means confessor. So Heylin, *Cyp. Ang.*, p. 101. Laud practically admitted it at his trial.

From that time they became close friends. It does not appear that Laud knew of the journey into Spain, kept secret as far as possible, till his friend had started on the foolish venture. Letters passed between them during his absence, and when he returned the friendship was knit more closely than ever, and Williams lost all favour with the Duke. From that time till his murder Buckingham and Laud grew more and more near together. Laud watched with him all night when he was sick,[1] stayed with him in the country, advised him about his unhappy brother, Lord Purbeck,[2] talked to him of all matters, from witches and astrologers to that tragic blot on his own life, the marriage of Lord Devon, christened his children, wrote letters and speeches for him on matters of Church and State, and was, as he styled himself in writing, his "most devoted and affectionate friend." It was a feeling not uncommon in the age in which he lived; it reminds one at times of Languet's attachment to Sidney, or Michelangelo's to Cavalieri. And of his wife, too much neglected, he writes that she is "goodness itself." It is clear that on Laud's side the aim of the friendship was above all things religious. He looked upon the fickle Duke as one upon whom, more especially after King James's death, the fortunes of England depended, and most of all the fortunes of the English Church. He was well-disposed: it was Laud's determination that he should be also well-informed. Thus he supplied him with the famous list of clergy for preferment, marked with the letters O and P. Thus he planned with him Church endowments, and fortified him with arguments against

[1] Whit Sunday, 1624, and Tuesday, he watched all night.
[2] *Cal. State Papers*, 1625-6, p. 363 (June 1626).

Rome and Geneva. He thought of him sleeping and waking.[1] His prayers show how near he was to his heart. "Gracious Father, I humbly beseech Thee, bless the Duke of Buckingham with all spiritual and temporal blessings, but especially spiritual. Make and continue him faithful to his prince, serviceable to his country, devout in Thy Truth and Church; a most happy husband and a blessed father; filled with the constant love and honour of his prince, that all Thy blessings may flow upon himself and his posterity after him. Continue him a true-hearted friend to me, Thy poor servant, whom Thou hast honoured in his eyes. . . . . Even so, Lord, and make him continually to serve Thee." Then follow other prayers to the same purport, "much used," as Prynne said,[2] "as is evident by the fouling of the leaves with his fingers."

Laud, in fact, as religious men of mature years do so naturally, always hoped and believed the best of his gallant young friend. If to others he was a profligate, to Laud he was a penitent. Laud cherished his best intentions, and believed, perhaps too often, that they would be performed. There was a tenderness indeed about his thoughts of the favourite which added a genuine personal affection to his religious care. It was a friendship which death and danger could not destroy. When he was charged at his trial, years after, with correspondence with Buckingham, he boldly answered, "My lord, I hold it my great honour that my lord duke would write to me and give me leave to write to him."

Of a different fashion and a different origin was his

[1] Diary, Aug. 21, 1625, *Works*, iii. 170. "Ea nocte in somnis visus est mihi Dux Buckinghamiae in lectum meum ascendere; ubi multo erga me amore se gessit."

[2] *Breviate*, p. 13.

friendship with Strafford. But it is probable that here also the beginning of the friendship was religion. The first entry in Laud's Diary relating to Wentworth, Jan. 21, 1630-31, is in terms similar to those used when Buckingham's confession is referred to. These two minds, whose religious belief and theories of government agreed, came naturally together. In method as well as thought their views were akin. What they boldly decided on they would bravely execute. They were not satisfied with smooth semblances: their ideal was "thoroughness" in action as in thought and life. Strafford, in fact, answered more nearly than any one else to the want, which even the self-contained Churchman felt, of a helpmeet in his deepest projects. "I am alone in those things which draw not private profit after them"—so he said pathetically. Thus, as Mr. Firth well says,[1] "the intimacy and the confidence between the two men rose naturally from their characters and position. Each had an unselfish devotion to the monarch he served, and to the ideas which he hoped to realize through the monarchy." When Wentworth was in Ireland the friends wrote constantly and intimately. Laud was the confidant of all the Deputy's political schemes, and the religious policy belonged to both alike. Strafford sent Laud duplicates of all his important despatches. Laud told Strafford of all his petty worries, as well as his great checks. Both chafed against "my lady Mora," and beat themselves in vain against the sluggish indolence of self-seeking courtiers. "Private ends," wrote Laud, "are such blocks in the public way, and lie so thick, that you may promise

[1] Introduction to Robert Browning's prose life of Strafford, p. lxvi.

what you will, and I must perform what I can and no more."

The mass of letters preserved is very great; Laud wrote more frequently to Strafford than to any other man. The letters touch not only public affairs,—the agreement of the two men being complete on all matters of policy, and the smallest details being discussed between them,—but also the private matters of the writers. The tone throughout is that of old friends, joking at each other's expense, grateful for remembrances, humouring each other's whims, and devoted to each other's interests, but chiefly to those views of national policy they had at heart.

Much of the correspondence on both sides was in cipher, and much of it was of a very private nature, revealing the distrust which both writers felt concerning the Queen's influence, Cottington, and others of the Court. Laud was not without fear of the discovery of the key. "The cipher[1] between us both you and I have. By that cipher all our letters may be read when we are dead. Some things you know are personal, and such as, though not hurtful, yet such as neither of us would have some men see."

From the time that the storm burst, and Strafford returned from Ireland to lead the King's force against the Scots, the correspondence ceased—or the letters have been destroyed. But the Diary, which has hitherto been silent about Wentworth since its first mention of him, adds a few details of the last years of the statesman. It records that they both advised the King, on December 27, 1639, to summon a Parliament: the impeachment and the trial too find place.

[1] *Works*, vii. 166.

The "History of the Troubles" also adds some significant touches, and gives a fuller account of Strafford's trial, ending with a comment on Charles's pitiful cowardice, bitter indeed in its brevity. "It had been far more regal to reject the Bill when it had been brought to him (his conscience standing so as his Majesty openly professed it did) than to make this honourable preface, and let the Bill pass after."[1]

The last meeting of the two friends is too famous to need telling again. The old prisoner fainting at the last sight of his staunch colleague, yet rising again to proclaim the condemned traitor "more serviceable to the Church (he would not mention the State) than either himself or any of all the Churchmen had ever been"—it is a picture perhaps the most pathetic that all those days of fears and fightings have left us.

"Thus ended," wrote Laud, "the wisest, the stoutest, and every way the ablest subject that this nation hath bred this many years. The only imperfections which he had, that were known to me, were his want of bodily health, and a carelessness, or rather roughness, not to oblige any; and his mishaps in this last action were that he groaned under the public envy of the nobles, served a mild and a gracious prince, who knew not how to be or be made great; and trusted false, perfidious, and cowardly men in the northern employment, though he had many doubts put to him about it. The day was after called by divers, *Homicidium Comitis Straffordiae*, 'the day of the murder of Strafford'; because, when malice itself could find no law to put him to death, they made a law of purpose for it. God forgive all, and be merciful."[2] It is the last touching

[1] Laud's *Works*, iii. 441. [2] *Ibid.*, 441.

word on the long friendship. If Laud loved no one so deeply as he loved Buckingham, he had no friend so true as Strafford.

It is the common fate of men immersed in business of Church or State, and not least of celibate ecclesiastics, and of those whose hearts are generous, to find among the many to whom they are related by ties of business, or generosity, or sympathy, scarce one sharer of the intimacies of the heart. Among the many who surrounded Laud, whom he met daily, and whom he benefited, there is scarce one besides Buckingham and Strafford who fills any place in his inner life. Windebanke was almost a creature of his hand, and for some years they were intimate. Laud stayed often at Haines Hill, and Windebanke professed to follow the Archbishop's lead in politics. But the friendship was broken; Windebanke proved self-seeking like the rest. Juxon, his successor as President of S. John's, raised by his influence to be Treasurer and Bishop of London, Laud loved and trusted. He had known him from his childhood, and they had worked together in college matters, where Juxon developed his extraordinary capacity for hard work and his keen business judgment. When Laud left the University Juxon was his Oxford correspondent, constantly writing him chatty letters of University doings and prophecies of preferment, so that he might see, he says, "the good opinion we have of ourselves at Oxford." He aided him too in the reconciliation of Chillingworth to the English Church, with the help of Sheldon, then Fellow of All Souls, eventually the successor of Laud and Juxon as Primate. As Bishop of London and as Lord Treasurer Juxon became Laud's right hand. The

hardest of workers, the kindest of men—"that good man," as Charles loved to call him—he was one of the few in that time of strife of whom it may be said that they made no enemies. "Neither as bishop nor treasurer," says Sir Philip Warwick, who had been his secretary, "came there any one accusation against him in that last parliament, whose ears were opened, nay itching, after such complaints," and Falkland, in an attack on the bishops, made an exception in his favour, "that in an unexpected place and power he expressed an equal moderation and humility, being neither ambitious before, nor proud after, either the crozier or the white staff."

William Cavendish, the gallant Marquis of Newcastle, was another friend of Laud, as he was a friend also of Strafford. He was a man upon whose honour they felt they could rely. Laud rejoiced at his appointment as governor to the young Prince of Wales. In his will he left him his "best diamond ring, worth £140, or near it." Noy, too, was his "dear friend."

Among those with whom he was intimate must certainly be reckoned many of his chaplains, and not least Dr. Peter Heylin, his enthusiastic biographer. It speaks well for the simplicity and genuineness of Laud's character that he was so much of a hero to those who were most near to him.

Beyond this we find scant record of his friends. Those mysterious initials in his Diary may conceal intimacies of which the world knows nothing. Prynne did not hesitate to suggest criminal relations, to which Laud's whole character is the best refutation. Some of them at least, it is clear, involved hours of spiritual conflict. It is not probable that any explanation of

them will ever be discovered.[1] Some may have covered deep and tender friendships, but most of them are probably records of private generosity to poor men which was ill repaid. Certainly people of all classes when in distress turned naturally to Laud to help them. Anne, Countess of Pembroke, when her husband treated her badly, hoped for Laud's mediation to obtain some relaxation of the severity with which he used her.[2] Many poor petitioners looked to him to help them in their need.

To his own dependents Laud was a generous master and friend. His will shows how great was his regard for those who had served him. His Diary has touching references to his love for his old retainers. Chiefest of these was Adam Torless, his steward, who managed his household at Lambeth, and in whose hands were the

[1] The matter may be worth further investigation. It is difficult, if not impossible, to trace any connection between the persons to whom the initials may refer, and any particular places or periods in Laud's history. E. B. and L. B. and R. B. are almost certainly related, and had probably some connection with Stony Stratford. E. B. was a man very intimate with Laud. There is much in the Diary which looks like the record of a close friendship. "Cum E. B., July 28, 1617, primo," in the Diary is to be read in connection with a prayer for pardon in the Anniversary Devotions, "as I was returning instead of thankfulness, I wandered out of my way from Thee, into a foul and strange path." The references to E. B. are very numerous. "On June 15, 1623, R. B. died at Stony Stratford, which what it will work with B. E., God in heaven knoweth and be merciful unto me." Unfortunately the Stony Stratford registers for 1623 are defective. E. B. (who was seemingly the same as B. E.) married May 1, 1624. There is no record of the marriage at Stony Stratford. On January 17, 1621, L. B. died. The Stony Stratford register on that day gives Widow Beste's burial. The name Baylie occurs in the Stony Stratford register about this date. It is possible that the persons referred to may have been relations of Dr. R. Baylie, Laud's protégé. But the difficulties are, I fear, insoluble.

[2] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, November 3, 1635.

arrangements for the great entertainment which he gave to the King and the University at Oxford in 1636. In 1624 Laud mentions his illness. "Saturday, October 2, in the evening, at Mr. Windebank's, my ancient servant, Adam Torless, fell into a swoon, and we had much ado to recover him; but, I thank God, we did." The record of his death is full of genuine feeling. "Thursday, September 23, 1641, Mr. Adam Torless, my ancient, loving, and faithful servant, and then my steward, after he had served me full forty and two years, died, to my great both loss and grief. For all my accounts since my commitment were in his hands, and had he not been a very honest and careful man, I must have suffered much more than I did; yet I suffered enough, besides the loss of his person, who was now become almost the only comfort of my affliction and my age." William Pennell, another servant, he dreamed of when he lay dying, and then visited him, and commended his soul to God. Many other servants are mentioned by name, always with some kindly word of remembrance. By the poor of Lambeth, at least, he was beloved; and it seems, indeed, that wherever he was intimately known, especially by the humbler classes, his sturdy honesty of soul, as well as his munificence, made his character respected and admired.

The picture that we glean of Laud from what we learn of his tastes and his friendships is an eminently human and pleasant one. He was clearly a man utterly without affectation, warm-hearted if hot-tempered, with no talent for disguise or diplomacy, a solid worker and a stalwart champion of what he believed to be right. His personal character goes some way to explain the permanent influence which he exercised upon the English Church.

CHAPTER III.

LAUD AND THE CHURCH.

On August 12, 1633, the *congé d'élire* was issued with the letter of nomination to the chapter of Canterbury. On September 19 Laud recorded in his Diary the completion of the translation. He was now in a position to carry out more fully the designs for the peace and reformation of the Church which he had long entertained and had already in some cases inaugurated.

To stand in the old paths was the closest wish of his heart, and to him those paths seemed clearly to be paths of peace. Constantly though he appeared before the world as a militant ecclesiastic, he was always in his mind suggesting articles of peace. Already he had endeavoured to win men to agreement, or at least to abstinence from war, by a formal declaration of the position which he had claimed for the Church of England in his controversy with Fisher. "The Church does not require assent unto particulars." This principle underlay his appeal for unity at the opening of Parliament in 1626: this was the basis of the proclamation for the peace of the Church which the King

issued on June 16 in the same year. It was his constant thesis; and it was embodied in the Declaration which Charles, undoubtedly on his advice, issued in November 1628, and which was intended to secure at least outward peace, by enjoining silence in the pulpits on those points on which men never had been, and never will be, agreed, but over which inflamed partisanship at the time so much delighted to wrangle.

"For the present, though some differences have been ill raised, yet we take comfort in this, that all clergymen within our realm have always most willingly subscribed to the Articles established, which is an argument that they all agree in the true, usual, literal meaning of the said Articles; and that even in those curious points in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the Articles of the Church of England to be for them; which is an argument again, that none of them intend any desertion of the Articles established. That therefore in these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years, in different times and places, exercised the Church of Christ, we will that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them. And that no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense."

The whole passage is eminently characteristic of

Laud's mind, as it is in parts of his style. The Declaration still holds its place in our prayer-books. It has certainly not prevented controversy on the Articles. It may, however, be said that the principle enunciated in the first paragraph, that the agreement of clergy of different schools of thought to the general sense of the Articles is a proof of the loyalty of each party to the general tenets of the Church, has been very generally adopted, and has been a material safeguard to the Church. The aim of the Declaration was unquestionably for peace; and the Catholicism of the Church was in no way affected by it. The strained constructions put upon the Articles at that time came from other quarters. The origin of the phraseology, which afterwards appeared questionable, was then too well known for the language to cause uneasiness to men of Laud's opinions.

The Declaration stands almost alone among the documents of the time as a genuine effort towards comprehension. And Laud was almost alone among the leaders of religion in his day in the endeavour to put its principles into practice. The widening of the English Church, without any abatement of its Catholic claims, had been one of the many projects of James I. In two famous instances his desires had seemed to be working towards fulfilment. The English Church gave shelter to Isaac Casaubon and Marc Antony de Dominis. The former had found in the Anglican theory, and in the practice of the Church as he knew it, the nearest approach to what seemed to him to be the Apostolic ideal. James had welcomed the greatest scholar in Europe with enthusiasm. Though a layman, he received prebends at Westminster and Canterbury, and he died in the communion of the English Church,

and was buried in Westminster Abbey. It was a triumph for the English Church to have enlisted the support of one whose name commanded respect throughout Europe. What James had done for Casaubon, Laud desired to do for Vossius; and he also received a prebend at Canterbury. Casaubon was an example of how theological learning, out of harmony with Protestantism, could find a meet home in the English Church. The Archbishop of Spalatro appeared to show that the real unity of Catholic Christendom, in spite of the English Reformation, was an idea not unfamiliar to the Roman theologians. The opinions of De Dominis, avaricious and unstable though he was, had just the characteristics which appealed to James's mind; and his book, *De Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ*, translated into ten languages, might have proved a valuable assistance towards reunion. But the defects of his personal character,[1] and the almost comical retribution with which his career ended, served to destroy any hopes that might have been formed from the public statement of his opinions. The careers of Casaubon and De Dominis proved of no real advantage to the aim of a more general and Catholic comprehension. With such failures before him, Laud had to be content with endeavours after comprehension in the British Isles. Such was his aim in Ireland, where he sought to win the Romanists by a relaxation of the recusancy fines and the teaching of Catholic doctrine. In England his measures looked the same way.

The most famous instance of the width of his sympa-

[1] Mountague called him "that infamous Ecebolius of these times, *religionis desuetor* . . . . a man, if any other of his coat and calling, apt enough to be circumcised and deny Christ, if the Grand Signior would but make him chief Muftie" (*Immediate Address unto God alone*).

thies—an instance sufficient in itself to absolve him for ever from the charge of narrowness and bigotry—is his action towards the "ever-memorable John Hales." It might have been thought that the opinions of a man so much beloved would have great influence, and that Laud would be jealous of views so liberal. It appears that nothing is further from the truth. Hales believed "that pride and passion, more than conscience, were the cause of all separation from each other's communion: and he frequently said that that only kept the world from agreeing upon such a Liturgy as might bring them into one communion; all doctrinal points upon which men differed in their opinions being to have no place in any Liturgy." His little tract on Schism came into the Archbishop's hands, "who," continues Clarendon, "was a very rigid surveyor of all things which never so little bordered upon schism; and thought the Church could not be too vigilant against and jealous of such incursions." The conclusion of the story is as honourable to Laud as to Hales. The Archbishop sent for the scholar to Lambeth: they talked in the garden almost all day, and when they came in they were "high-coloured and almost panting for want of breath, enough to show that there had been some heats between them, not then fully cooled." Laud had said "that the time was very apt to set new doctrines on foot, of which the wits of the age were too susceptible; and that there could not be too much care taken to preserve the peace and unity of the Church." Shortly afterwards he sent for Hales again, "when there was a prebendary of Windsor fallen, and told him the King had given him the preferment, because it lay so convenient to his Fellowship of Eton, which (though indeed

the most convenient preferment that could be thought of for him) the Archbishop could not without great difficulty persuade him to accept, and he did accept it rather to please him than himself, because he really believed he had enough before. He was one of the least men in the kingdom, and one of the greatest scholars in Europe."

The natural corollary to Laud's desire for comprehension was his dislike of separation. To this he clung to the last, and in his answer to Lord Saye and Sele he defined clearly what he meant by the term. "He, whoever he be, that will not communicate in public prayers with a national Church, which serves God as she ought, is a separatist."[1] Thus he placed the Romanists as well as "Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists, Familists," among the sects which "endeavoured" the "subversion both of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England."[2] The system of the Church of England, as he found it, settled in formularies and doctrines, in the rule of belief and the rule of worship, preserving its historic links with the primitive and historic Christianity, but laying upon men's consciences no weightier burden of necessary belief than the first ages had required—this it was his aim to preserve as it was his duty to administer. Within its pale he would include those who could accept its formularies in their most liberal interpretation; but he would preserve, by every means in the power of State or Church, its heart of doctrine and worship from the attacks of those who felt compelled to stand without and in opposition.

[1] *Works*, vi. 120. [2] *Ibid.*, v. 622. Canons of 1640.

It has been stated[1] that Laud was above all things a doctrinal reformer. It is true that the banishment of Calvinistic teaching from the English pulpits seemed to him a matter of supreme importance. But on the other hand, he was certainly not consciously an innovator. He had chapter and verse for everything he did. He appealed constantly to the English articles and canons, to the Prayer-Book and the Bible. Outside these and the patristic authorities he had no wish to stray, certainly no wish to enforce compliance. He was in principle a conservative, not a reformer, though a practical reformation was the result of many of his measures.

He started upon his work with the full support of the Crown. Erastian he was not, for he desired that in religion the State should serve and not command the Church. But the distinction in principle was not easy to preserve in practice, and in the public mind the Archbishop's functions as privy councillor and prelate, in the Star Chamber and on the bishop's throne, were very naturally confused. Charles and Laud worked hand in hand, and their wiser measures suffered from association with political blunders.

Already something had been done by the State to induce the conformity which Laud desired. In December 1629 the King had sent out instructions to the bishops, by which the "lecturers"[2] were to be

[1] As by Dr. Mozley, *Essays*, i. 163.

[2] Mr. Gardiner very happily describes the position of the lecturers, vol. vii. p. 131. A lecturer "was paid by a corporation, or by individuals, to preach and to do nothing more. He might remain sitting in the vestry, if he chose, till the service was at an end, when he could come out to ascend the pulpit, and to shine forth in the eyes of the congregation as one who was far superior to the man by whom the printed prayers had been recited. The

strictly restrained. Controversial topics were to be rigidly excluded from sermons, the afternoon discourse was to be catechetical and for the young, and no teacher was to preach unless he had first read Divine Service in his surplice. The bishops were to make stricter oversight of the doings of the lecturers, and, in accordance with the canons of 1604, and the advice of Hooker, the bishops were "to suffer none but noblemen and men qualified by law to have a chaplain in their house."

It was an honest attempt to stop wrangling, and it was honestly carried out. A "restraint on both sides" was intended.[1] The Council suppressed the Calvinist Bishop Davenant as Laud suppressed the orthodox Master of Trinity, Cambridge. Silence, it was hoped, might bring consent. But it is ill trying to enforce silence on excited theologians by the secular arm. Laud, as soon as he became Primate, caused the injunctions to be re-issued. It was ever his aim to abolish "vagrant ministers and trencher-chaplains."

While the injunctions, one fruit of the State action on behalf of the Church, were touching the Puritan party in one direction, *The Book of Sports* was arousing discontent in another. The old English custom of employing the Sunday in recreation, after public worship, had never been abandoned; and there were special Church feasts in commemoration of particular festivals and in aid of Church work.[2] Puritanism from the first

lecturers were to be found chiefly in towns where there was a strong Puritan element in the population, and they were themselves Puritan almost to a man."

[1] So Charles's speech in answer to the Remonstrance, which was written by Laud. *Works*, vi. 9.

[2] See Pierce's letter, *Cant. Doome*, 142-3.

had desired to use Sunday strictly as the Jewish Sabbath: Fuller humorously describes how the "precise keeping" of the day spread among the religious. James I. had sought to pacify disputants by a Declaration, which was afterwards embodied in *The Book of Sports*. But the judges had disregarded both ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the royal order. They had forbidden all village feasts on Sundays, and required the clergy, under penalty, to publish their order during Divine service. This was an absolutely unwarrantable intrusion into the sphere of ecclesiastical rule, and it was one which neither King nor Archbishop were likely to tolerate. Charles issued the Declaration of Sports, ordering that the people

"be not disturbed, letted, or discouraged from any lawful recreation, such as dancing, either men or women, archery for men, leaping, vaulting or any other such harmless recreation, nor for having of May games, Whitsun-ales, and morris-dances, so as the same be had in due and convenient time without impediment or neglect of Divine service."

Chief-Justice Richardson, who had greatly exceeded his legal power, when on the Western Circuit, by punishing those clergy who had not published the order condemning such games, was called before the Council and received a severe reprimand. It may well be imagined how Laud, whose inclination in such matters were all in favour of freedom, and who had now a fine opportunity to avenge the intrusion into Church jurisdiction, would rate the officious lawyer. "He had been almost choked with a pair of lawn sleeves," he declared when he came out. But it was King and Council, it must not be forgotten, who intervened, not Laud or the

clergy. Many of the parish priests indeed hesitated to read the King's declaration. It was a vain attempt to legislate where custom and public feeling were too strong for the State. It pledged King and Archbishop against a narrow Sabbatarianism. But it increased the animosity which was rising against them among the bigoted zealots to whom all recreation was unlawful.

On one other point we find the Crown issuing orders which had come with better grace from the Church. On November 12, 1630, the Council wrote to Laud that[1] "the King, foreseeing the present scarcity, by a late proclamation, required that there should be an abstinence from flesh on Fridays, and no suppers kept on fasting nights in inns and victualling houses. That proclamation contains no new thing, but points directly to laws in force for keeping of fasting days, as in 2nd and 3rd Edward VI. cap. 19, and 5th and 6th of the same king, cap. 3, and certain statutes of Queen Elizabeth. The King's care in that behalf is so much contemned in inns and such-like places, as seems very strange to his Majesty and this Board; for reformation whereof the Council have given instructions to the Mayor of London and the Justices of the Peace of Westminster and the nearest counties, and it is his Majesty's pleasure that the ecclesiastical court shall take effectual order that the offenders be punished in the manner expressed in the last-mentioned statute of Edward VI."

The State requiring fasting, for economic reasons, and insisting upon the Church giving its sanction to the plan, is a curious illustration of the confusion of functions which is the most prominent characteristic of

[1] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, 1629-31, p. 379.

the time. Such a measure was certain to arouse opposition. The Church lost much more than it gained by the patronizing interference of the State.

Such was the alliance to which Laud as Primate became one of the partners. It was no creation of his or the King's. Puritans as well as Churchmen thought some such union essential; and both suffered from the attempts to work an unworkable theory.

The beginning of Laud's primacy showed the influence of the State at its height. On the day when the forms of his translation were completed, the King addressed a letter to the new Primate, giving directions, in fashion familiar enough in the time of Elizabeth, for the new Archbishop to follow. The chief point of his injunction was the very necessary restriction of ordination. The good of religion, dear to the King's heart, impels him to require the Archbishop and bishops to strictly obey the canon requiring a title for every person ordained, and to follow in such matters "the ancient course of the Church and the Canon Law, so far forth as that law is received in this Church of England."[1] The Crown had no thought to abandon the prerogative which Elizabeth had exercised, of issuing injunctions and directions, of commanding and enforcing by royal authority what a more scrupulous age would have left to the ecclesiastical power. It was the deep-rooted idea of the time. Abroad it was shared by Catholic and Protestant, by Louis XIV. and the Great Elector. At home the Parliament claimed still more clearly than the Crown to interpret the union between Church and State, and exercised the more widely, as the King's power fell into abeyance, the authority of the Sovereign Body over all estates of the

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, 1633-4, p. 212.

realm. But Erastian though the temper of the age was, and though the councillors of the Stuart kings clung to theories of State supremacy to which bishops like Laud did not yield, Charles did not consider that the claim of the Crown involved any diminution of the dignity of the Primate. Laud was specially directed, at his translation, "to use all such ceremonies and offices, and to carry himself with the same state and dignity, and to assume such privileges and pre-eminences as his predecessors in that see have used and enjoyed heretofore."[1]

Assured of the royal support, and animated by a keen desire to restore the Church to its high estate, Laud, with his characteristic preference for practical realities, turned at once to the restoration of order and reverence in public worship.

"No one thing," he had said to the King in the "Epistle Dedicatory" to his conference with Fisher,[2] "hath made conscientious men more wavering in their own minds, or more apt and easy to be drawn aside from the sincerity of religion professed in the Church of England, than the want of uniform and decent order in too many churches of the kingdom; and the Romanists have been apt to say, the houses of God could not be suffered to lie so nastily, as in some places they have done, were the true worship of God observed in them, or did the people think that such it were. It is true, the inward worship of the heart is the great service of God, and no service acceptable without it; but the external worship of God in His Church is the great witness to the world, that our heart stands right

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, 1633-4, p. 204.
[2] *Works*, ii. xvi.

in that service of God. Take this away, or bring it into contempt, and what light is there left 'to shine before men that they may see our devotion, and glorify our Father which is in Heaven'? And . . . . these thoughts are they, and no other, which have made me labour so much as I have done for decency and an orderly settlement of the external worship of God in the Church; for of that which is inward there can be no witness among men nor no example for men. Now, no external action in the world can be uniform without some ceremonies; and these in religion, the ancienter they be the better, so they may fit time and place. Too many overburden the service of God, and too few leave it naked. And scarce anything hath hurt religion more in these broken times than an opinion in too many men, that because Rome hath thrust some unnecessary and many superstitious ceremonies upon the Church, therefore the Reformation must have none at all; not considering therewhile, that ceremonies are the hedge that fence the substance of religion from all the indignities which profaneness and sacrilege too commonly put upon it. And a great weakness it is, not to see the strength which ceremonies—things weak enough in themselves, God knows—add even to religion itself."

It would be difficult to find a passage which more accurately expresses the principles by which Laud was guided in his action with regard to the external order of the Church, or more conclusively acquits him from the charges that have been brought against him of a preference of the material to the spiritual aspect of religion. "The inward service of the heart" appealed as closely to him as to the sternest Puritan, but the

clearness of his mind and his practical knowledge of men taught him not to ignore the casket while he cherished the treasure which it preserved.

There is no ground for asserting that Laud assumed "that the human mind could only be purified by submission to a certain external order," [1] or that he advocated "the pursuit of peace in preference to the pursuit of truth." [2] Outward observances, "things weak enough in themselves," were to him valuable only as safeguards of the reverence with which every spiritual mind must regard Divine things, and as evidences of that holy awe and fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom. To him Crashaw's lines would seem to mark the difference between the Puritan and the Anglican conception of worship—

> "One stands up close and treads on high,
> Where th' other dares not bend his eye.
> One nearer to God's altar trod,
> The other to the altar's God."

To him spiritual things were not dim imaginations but abiding realities, and the ineffable mysteries of Divine love were made visible to the eye of faith. Humbled to the dust by sin, and praying ever with the tears of a penitent, he still delighted to think of the glory of God, and to adore Him in all the dignity and devotion of public worship. "Power and honour are in His sanctuary." Laud could not shake off the reverence of ages, or abandon the material helps in

[1] S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. Engl.*, vii. 18.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 125. Mr. Gardiner continues—"There was in his mind no dim sense of the spiritual depths of life, no reaching forward to ineffable mysteries veiled from the eye of flesh." I think Laud's prayers show that his religion so permeated his life that the "depths" were no longer "dim."

which the Church had ever sought both to honour and to draw nigh.

How far was the reality of worship in his day from the ideal of dignity which he desired, is abundantly evident. It might well be said that many of the churches did "lie nastily." In some parts of England the idea of reverence seemed altogether to have departed. In Bedfordshire, for instance, it was charged against the churchwardens of Knotting, that in 1634-36 fighting-cocks were brought into the chancel, and a fight held before the altar, "in the presence of many persons assembled as spectators of the sport, who betted and laid wagers and performed 'the other offices ordinarily used by cock-fighters.'" It was stated that the minister of the parish was himself present.[1] Instances of irreverence even more gross may be found in the literature of the time. If they seem incredible, it needs but a slight acquaintance with the customs of some Catholic nations at the present day to show that in certain states of society such irreverence is not unusual.

When the sense of decency in Divine worship was so far lost, it might have been expected that even the most sacred things should be contemned. The altars, which the iconoclasm of Edward VI. would have made mere "oyster-boards," had in many cases been removed from the chancels and placed in the body of the church, but should, according to the injunctions of Elizabeth, have been replaced "in the place where the altar stood . . . so to stand saving when the Communion of the Sacrament is to be distributed; at which time the same shall be so placed within the chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard, and the communicants

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, 1637, preface (cccIxx. no. 90).

also more conveniently and in more number communicate with the said minister." Practical difficulties, however, interfered with the constant moving of the Holy Table, and thus in some churches it was always left in the middle of the church, while in others, as in the royal chapels and most of the cathedrals, it was never moved from the east end.

Laud's love of regularity and order, if nothing else, would have urged him to obtain the removal of the altar to a permanent position at the east end. It is not necessary to assert that he was actuated by the belief in the doctrines of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which he, like Andrewes, undoubtedly held, for he was well aware that the position of the altar, as for instance in churches of the basilican type at Rome and elsewhere, did not affect the profession of any Catholic doctrine. But practically the moving of the altar, and still more the permanent position in the middle of the church or the chancel, tended of necessity to irreverence. In crowded churches the rough rustics laid their hats and coats on it, and it shared in the general neglect which carelessness and a false idea of opposition between spiritual and external worship had engendered.

Laud's action at Gloucester, when he permanently fixed the altar at the east end, and ordered that all the officials should make reverence towards it as they entered and left the church, was dictated primarily by the desire to restore a spirit of reverence. Uniformity and an obedience to Church order were secondary but almost equally important motives. The canons required that all should receive the Holy Sacrament kneeling; the custom of royal chapels and cathedrals justified the bowing towards the altar as it did its position at the

east end. "When this reverence is performed," said Laud at his trial, "'tis to God as to the Creator, and so divine; but 'tis only 'toward' not 'to' the altar."

In 1627 the questions which centred round the altar had come into debate through the action of the vicar of Grantham, who placed the Holy Table at the east end of the choir. Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, gave his decision that it should be removed on occasion, according to the injunctions. Himself in practice an indifferentist, with a fondness for pomp, as the description of his own private chapel shows, he was in doctrine opposed to the teaching of Andrewes and Laud. He justified his order by a condemnation of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. In 1633 the question again became prominent. The precedent set by Laud at Gloucester, or, to speak more strictly, the usage of the royal chapels and the cathedrals, had been generally followed, but there remained many districts in which uniformity had not been obtained. No general order was yet issued on the subject, but when occasion arose the more dignified position was required.

The church of S. Gregory, which was under the jurisdiction of the Dean and Chapter of S. Paul's, had been restored at the cost of £2000. The dean and chapter, declaring that the altar had been irreverently used, and that men "had not been ashamed to sit on it, others to write, others to transact there other and perhaps viler matter of business, distinguishing nothing or little between the Lord's table and a plain or convivial table," directed that it should in future be placed altarwise at the east end. Five of the parishioners appealed to the Court of Arches. The King called the suit into the Privy Council, because the Dean of Arches

was known to be prejudiced, and "certain to decide in favour of the complainants."[1] After a long hearing Charles declared that the decision of the Ordinary must be obeyed. He pointed out that the objection of a few parishioners, if allowed, might upset any settled order.

The complainants had perhaps wisely grounded their case not upon Elizabeth's injunctions, the ecclesiastical validity of which was questionable, but upon a liberty allowed by the Prayer-Book and the Eighty-second Canon. The question arose, to whom belonged the liberty? "For so much," said Charles, "as concerns the liberty given by the said Common Prayer-Book or canon, for placing the Communion table in any church or chapel with most conveniency; that liberty is not so to be understood as if it were ever left to the discretion of the parish, much less to the particular fancy of any humorous person, but to the judgment of the Ordinary."[2] Thus the dean and chapter, as ordinaries, won their case. The decision was an obviously reasonable one. But for some such court of appeal it would have been impossible to preserve churches from the wilder excesses of congregationalism. The discretion in this, as in other cases already provided, could best rest with the Ordinary.

At the same time as this decision, in a case referred to him from Leicester, Bishop Williams had again ordered that the altar should remain at the east wall except when used for the participation of the sacred mysteries. His order did not in theory conflict with Charles's judgment. In each case the ordinary acted as a court

[1] Gardiner, *Hist. Engl.*, vii. p. 310; and *Cal. State Papers*, October 18, 1633.

[2] The act of the Privy Council is given in Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents*, pp. 35-37.

of appeal. So matters remained until Laud as Primate undertook a metropolitical visitation.

Established at Canterbury, with the full support of the King, Laud determined upon a great effort to make the English Church recognize and display its unity through an uniformity of worship and ceremonial, which its formularies undoubtedly contemplated, and which only the leavening influence of foreign Protestantism had disturbed.

Accordingly, at the beginning of 1634 he instituted a visitation of all the dioceses of his province, undertaken after pre-Reformation precedent, in right of his metropolitan authority. The work was continued in the two following years, and was placed in the hands of his vicar-general, Sir Nathaniel Brent,[1] warden of Merton College, Oxford, and afterwards of Sir John Lambe, Dean of Arches. The articles for the visitation, says Heylin, "had in them little more than ordinary," and this may be seen by reference to the many that are preserved. They relate chiefly in the case of cathedrals to the requirements of the capitular statutes, and in the case of parish churches to the orders of the Prayer-Book and canons. "But he had given directions," continues Heylin,[2] "to his Vicar-General to inquire into the observation of his Majesty's instructions of the year 1629, to command the said churchwardens to place the Communion table under the eastern wall of the chancel, where formerly the altar stood; to set a decent rail before it to avoid profaneness; and at the rails the communicants to receive the

[1] It appears from Heylin that at one time it was intended that he should be a joint commissioner, but afterwards the idea was abandoned.—*Cypr. Anglic.*, p. 285. [2] *Ibid.*

Blessed Sacrament." It was this general order, which needs no justification at the present day, and which was then urgently required in the interests of decency and reverence, the enforcement of which was the most permanent result of the visitation, since it gave the rule which has ever since been observed. It was a definite assertion of the place of the altar, and not the pulpit, as the centre of worship in the English Church. As such it was taken by the Puritans, as such resisted, and as such charged against Laud at his trial. Nor did he ever refuse to meet his opponents on this ground. "Mr. Brown,[1] in his summary charge, pressed this against me. I answered as before, and added that in all ages of the Church the touchstone of religion was not to hear the word preached but to communicate. And at this day many will come and hear sermons, who yet will not receive the Communion together. And as I call the Holy Table the greatest place of God's residence on earth, so doth a late learned divine of this Church [Thorndike] call the celebration of the Eucharist 'the crown of public service, and the most solemn and chief work of Christian assemblies.'" He had said, and he stood to it, that "the altar is the greatest place of God's residence upon earth, greater than the pulpit, for there 'tis *Hoc est Corpus Meum*, this is My Body; but in the other it is at most but *Hoc est Verbum Meum*, This is My Word; and a greater reverence is due to the Body, than the Word, of the Lord."

The removal of the altars seems to have been carried out during the visitation without much opposition. There were occasional protests, but on the whole the change was peaceably adopted. The parishioners of

[1] *Works*, iv. 284.

All Hallows, Barking,[1] petitioned the Archbishop that the Holy Table recently removed by their vicar might be restored to its place. The churchwardens of Beckington also appealed to him against the decision of the Bishop of Bath and Wells.[2] But these seem to have been exceptional cases. However strong may have been the feeling of Puritanism, it did not immediately betray itself.

The work of the visitation was, however, by no means confined to the regulation of the position of the altars. The notes written by Laud for the instruction of Sir Nathaniel Brent cover a large field of ecclesiastical law and usage, both "general" and "particular." Schools were no longer to be kept in the chancel of a church; fonts were to be restored to their ancient place; chancels "severed from the church or other ways profaned" were to be altered; strict inquiry was to be made into "peculiars" held by prebendaries or by lay persons.

In the parish churches, as a rule, besides the removal, where necessary, of the altars, no changes were made, and no requirements were stated beyond those of an ordinary episcopal visitation. In the cathedrals, on the other hand, the demands were more extensive. The perennial difficulty of episcopal contest over capitular bodies had by no means disappeared at the Reformation. The statutes by which the chapters were bound were very frequently evaded. Laud had no tolerance for such breach of rule. As Archbishop and visitor he could exercise a control which had been impossible to the bishops. Of the minuteness of the inquiries which

[1] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, 1637-8, p. 67.
[2] Prynne, *Canterburie's Doome*, p. 97.

his metropolitical visitation involved, and of the curious answers which were elicited, the records of the Salisbury inquiry, preserved among the papers of the House of Lords,[1] afford a characteristic illustration. The questions start from the ancient obligations of the cathedral officers—"Whether have you any ancient laws, statutes, or ordinances . . . . whereby your church is governed, and who is accompted to be first author or founder of them, and whether have they been altered or changed at any time?" He is careful to assert the continuity of the obligations; there is indeed no reference to any Reformation changes in the articles of inquiry. The statutory residence, the duty of private hospitality, the preaching of sermons, the management of cathedral property, especially in the matter of leases, the ministration of Sacraments, the teaching and training of the choir, the private worthiness of the ministers, the attendance at the daily morning and evening services—these are the questions which were pressed by Sir Nathaniel Brent upon the officials of each degree. The answers reveal a curious medley of personal quarrels and indifferent performances of duty. "We have been defective, but we will amend," is the burden of many a reply. The choristers were not taught as they should be, nor "well ordered and instructed in the art of singing." Most of the prebendaries answer, as it is still the custom to answer all official questionings, as briefly as may be, and with care rather to conceal than to impart information. But here and there a little personal spite brings one prebendary or another into an angry prolixity which throws a flood of light on the management of cathedrals at the time when Laud was

[1] Printed in *Wiltshire Notes and Queries*, nos. 1—3.

determined to make them worthy centres and representatives of the highest worship. Dr. Seward's household causes scandal: Mr. Edward Thornborough "spends too much for his ease with too little discretion": the "vergerers" neglect their duties: "our book of ancient statutes is neither punctually observed nor indeed acknowledged by most of us to be of any power. Answer will be made, we are sworn to customs as well as statutes—and customs we make and break according to our ease or profit."

Laud's register contains many other examples of minute inquiry, and the answers, with the injunctions issued in consequence, reveal curious cases of neglect of duty. At Lincoln, for instance, the altar was "not very decent," and the rail was worse. The organs were "old and naught." The copes and vestments had been embezzled, and worse irregularities appeared to be not uncommon.[1]

The defects revealed by the visitation gave occasion for further inquiry and correspondence with the bishops and chapters. Thus in 1635 we find Laud writing to the Chapter of Wells in the case of Mr. Warde and his residence, which had been submitted to him by the King.[2] Bishops such as Mountague welcomed his interference, and frequently solicited his aid in such matters as non-residence. Mr. Hickes would not perform his canonical duties in Chichester Cathedral, wrote Mountague, but sent as substitutes "whom he can get, sometime good, sometime bad, any riff-raff, whom he can light upon, shifters, Nonconformists, curates, young boys, Puritans, as the whole city hath

[1] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, Sept. 9, 1634.
[2] *Hist. MSS. Comm. Report X.*, App., pt. 4, p. 258.

often spoken against it."[1] Some years before he had been kept informed of the case of Peter Smart, Prebendary of Durham, who had protested vigorously against the order of the Cathedral service, and the use of the vestments required by the canons of 1604, and had been deprived of his prebend.[2] It does not appear that he actively interfered, but his influence was known to be on the side of Cosin the Dean. Such changes as were carried out seemed to be acceptable to the people, for Bishop Howson, writing to Laud in 1630, declared that the people, after their own parochial services which were early, "came by troops to the cathedral."[3]

In all these matters it does not appear that Laud advocated any extravagant changes, or that he consciously wandered beyond the orders and formularies of the Church. The charges of "popery" which were brought against him, if they were not equally applicable to the framers of the Prayer-Book and canons, fell within very narrow limits. The use of his private chapel, his manner of consecrating a church, the wearing of the ancient vestments, these were not great matters, and in one of them at least he had direct warrant. Indeed he did not even go so far as the Prayer-Book ordered, for his "ornaments" were far below the requirements of the second year of King Edward VI. At his trial he was charged with the use of "organs, candlesticks, a picture of a history at the back of the altar, and copes at communions and consecrations." He replied, "First, these things have been in use ever since

[1] Mountague to Laud, Jan. 16, 1632.

[2] Wentworth applied to Laud to use his influence to obtain the vacant prebend for his chaplain, Dr. Carr.—*Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, Oct. 3, 1630.

[3] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, March 17, 1631.

the Reformation. And secondly . . . . it was in my chapel as it was at White-hall: no difference. And it is not to be thought, that Queen Elizabeth and King James would have endured them all their time in their own chapel had they been introductions for Popery. And for copes, they are allowed at times of communion by the canons of the Church."

The use of his own chapel again seems to have been extremely simple, for his accusers could only charge him with having painted windows, and consecrating the new vessels for use at the Eucharist, and with allowing a "crucifix" in the glass and on the hangings. Something more elaborate appeared in the ceremonial adopted at the consecration of the Church of S. Catherine Cree. Prynne grotesquely mocked at it in *Canterburie's Doome*.[1] There was the singing of the 24th Psalm, and sundry "bowings, duckings, and cringings," and much reverence at the altar: but Laud was able to answer that he did not follow the "'Pontifical,' but a copy of learned and reverend Bishop Andrewes."

All these things in the light of modern controversies may seem small matters to warrant a capital charge, and indeed as we read the records of the time we may marvel at Laud's moderation. It would be absurd to use against him the angry language which has been showered upon modern "ritualists." The most timid of latitudinarians has in these days gone beyond him. But still, however absurd their objections to particular actions, the Puritans were right in recognizing his position as one of irreconcilable antagonism to their own. The battle-ground changes as the years go on, but the warfare is still the same. Laud, with all his modera-

[1] P. 115 *sqq.*

tion, was firm in his adherence to the old paths. The position of the altar, the surplice, the cope, the stated forms of prayer which the ages had allowed, were links to the primitive and undivided body. The orders and formularies of his own Church seemed, at the worst, never to have severed Anglicanism from historic Christianity. There were safeguards too as well as links, and to these he clung as a soldier fallen into an ambush of his foes.

It was this feeling, romantic and emotional as well as practical, bringing with it beautiful memories, and binding the ages of English devotion each to each by natural piety, that appealed so forcibly to contemporaries whose lives were very different from his own. Cosin's book of devotions, designed to provide the English ladies of the Court with as near a companion in the religious life as the French ladies of the Queen possessed, was, we may almost say, compiled under Laud's influence. Saints and ascetics as well as scholars and statesmen confided to him their hopes and their designs.

How readily the best devotion then nurtured in England looked to him as its head may be seen by the example of the leader of the revival of the religious life in the English Church. Nicholas Ferrar, who had been Fellow of Clare, Cambridge, a prominent member of the Council of the Virginia Company, and active among the popular party in Parliament when he sat for Lymington, had settled at Little Gidding, and ordered his household on the lines of a home of pious seclusion. When he determined to seek Ordination—a desire which he kept secret even from his mother and his dearest friends—it was to Laud that he applied, and was by him that he was ordained deacon on Trinity

Sunday, 1625. The house at Little Gidding, with its beautiful asceticism and its tender simplicity, its life of rule and of devotion, was under Laud's sanction. It was by him when he was Archbishop that John Ferrar was presented to the King when he bought the rich concordance which Charles ever after read daily. Gidding, said the Archbishop, should be called no longer Parva but Magna. In 1640 the young Nicholas went to Lambeth with his father. Laud "embraced him very lovingly," and said of the books he brought, "they were jewels for princes." The account which John Ferrar gives of his interview with the Archbishop, and his great kindness to the bright boy, is a beautiful picture of the true piety and gentleness of Laud's nature. "Nicholas Ferrar kneeling down took the Bishop by the hand and kissed it. He took him up in his arms and laid his hand on his cheek, and earnestly besought God Almighty to bless him, and increase all grace in him, and fit him every day more and more for an instrument of His glory here upon earth and a saint in heaven, 'which,' said he, 'is the only happiness that can be desired, and ought to be our chief end in all our actions. God bless you! God bless you! I have told your father what is to be done for you after the holidays. God will provide for you better than your father can. God bless you and keep you.' So they parted from his Grace."

A Little Gidding book, which Laud gave to his old college, is still one of the choicest treasures of S. John's.

It was to Laud also that George Herbert owed the final direction of his life. His influence touched the gallant young scholar at the very crisis of his hesitation,

when he was doubting whether to serve the King, with every prospect of the highest preferment, or to accept the offer of the little country parish of Bemerton, and give his life to God and the poor. Pembroke told Laud of his kinsman's irresolution; and he, says Isaac Walton, "did the next day so convince Mr. Herbert that the refusal of it was a sin, that a tailor was sent for to come speedily from Salisbury to Wilton, to take measure and make him canonical clothes against next day." It must never be forgotten that it was Laud's influence which gave to the English Church the work of George Herbert and of Chillingworth, while it ratified the very different services of John Hales and Nicholas Ferrar.

But Laud's services to the Church were material as well as spiritual. It was his aim to make the clergy the equals of the gentry to whom it was their duty to minister. The "lecturers," who lived upon benefactions which inevitably tended to make them the preachers of doctrines insisted upon by their patrons, and those generally of a particular school, the domestic chaplains whose position was too often a disgrace to themselves and those with whom they lived, were restricted and confined by his action in every possible way. He decided to bring all under rule, but to make all worthy to command. So long as the clergy were impoverished and lived from hand to mouth on the doles of those whose fathers had robbed the Church, it was impossible that their status should be any higher than that of the colourless clergy that swarmed in the lands where the Reformation had made no way. Thus, as in Ireland he obtained the impropriations from the Crown for the Church, in England he endeavoured constantly to restore to the clergy the endowments of

which the Church had been deprived. At the same time he strenuously resisted any attempt to turn these endowments to the service of a particular faction, and the scheme to endow Puritan preaching by the purchase of impropriations was at once suppressed by his hand.[1]

The great London church was always very near his heart. It was through him that "Paules" ceased to be the haunt of thieves and profligates, and the meeting-place for tramps and swashbucklers. He organized collections in every diocese for the restoration of the fabric. He spent over £1200 himself on the work. He obtained the grant of the fines in the High Commission Court to the same object. He worked incessantly, and aroused often the keenest animosity by his eagerness for the removal of the houses that trenched upon the cathedral. The King aided him, and Inigo Jones built the extraordinary portico which was tacked on to the great medieval cathedral. The State papers are full of records of sums drawn from all over England, and the total cost of the work performed was over £100,000. It was a great undertaking, worthy of the medieval and renaissance bishops, who delighted in building, and it well illustrates Laud's aim to revive the dignity and magnificence of the Church.

It is difficult, as we look through the mass of literature that entombs the history of Laud's work for the Church, to disentangle the threads, and to present any clear image which adequately represents the extent of his multifarious activity. Perhaps we may see it most clearly in the yearly reports of his province which he submitted to the King. We possess the accounts of the years 1633-39, with the King's notes, a curious

[1] See *Canterburie's Doome*, p. 385 *sqq.*

record of the fellow-work of sovereign and minister. They are concerned with matters the most minute, as well as with more general principles, the observance of statutes, the existence or growth of nonconformity or recusancy, excommunications, non-residence, the assertion of episcopal control. They show the eagerness, the restlessness, of Laud's oversight, and they illustrate again and again the difficulties with which he had to contend. Ignorance, indifference, vice, were his great foes; and he had to withstand the opposition also of men as able, if not as determined, as himself. As in the State he found Cottington and Windebanke opponents, if not rivals, in the Church he had to deal with Williams and Goodman.

Williams was a man of great capacity and worldly wisdom. As Lord-Keeper, he had won the respect of many of the lawyers, though Clarendon says he was "most generally abominated." During the last year of James I.'s reign, he had occupied a very prominent position, but Charles appears always to have entertained for him a rooted dislike, and Buckingham became eventually his bitter enemy.[1] It was natural that a man so ambitious, and one who had held so high a place, should resent his dismissal from office and the order to reside in his diocese, and should dislike the man whom the King and favourite delighted to honour in his stead.

Anything of rancour in Laud towards Williams is not to be discovered in his public action or in the correspondence between them which he so carefully preserved, and which may still be seen at Lambeth,—Williams's letters carefully endorsed in Laud's own hand with date and subject. It was rather Charles's dislike and

[1] Gardiner, vol. viii. pp. 250, 390.

Williams's shiftiness, with the stress and tumult of the times, that brought the two men into conflict. Williams had been charged with revealing the King's secrets contrary to his oath as councillor, and later, on clear evidence, of subornation of perjury.[1] The scandal of such an offence in a bishop made a heavy penalty not unnatural. He was to be imprisoned during the King's pleasure, fined £10,000, and, by the Court of High Commission, suspended from the exercise of his functions. The sentence, considering the punishments of the time, was not severe, and it was natural that all those who highly regarded the clerical office should not visit the offence lightly. Laud himself voted for the penalty as it was inflicted, and his speech leaves no doubt of the reasons which influenced him. It was above all things necessary to preserve the highest standard of honour among the clergy. The mendacity of Williams was unhappily notorious, and the flagrant case brought before the courts was an occasion which could not be passed by. But the scandal was none the less felt. "We have adversaries too many amongst ourselves," said Laud, "but this day's work opens a way for the Romanists to take advantage by it, to see so eminent a person as a bishop, and so eminent a bishop as he, to become thus censurable in a thing of so high a nature."[2] Laud's own conduct was throughout most generous to Williams. "I have been," he stated, "five several times on my knees to the King my master on his behalf," and their correspondence shows that he "dealt truly and really" in the matter.

Two years later, Williams was again sentenced in the

[1] See Gardiner, vol. viii. p. 250 *sqq*.
[2] Speech at the trial (*Works*, vi. 71).

Star Chamber in connection with letters found in his house in which were very evident allusions to Laud as "the little meddling hocus-pocus," and "the little urchin." In this case again it is clear that Williams perjured himself. When we add to this record the immortal infamy of which he was guilty in advising Charles that his public conscience might justly allow Strafford to suffer, while his private conscience acquitted him, we cannot feel for Williams anything but contemptuous repugnance. He refused the offer of pardon and a bishopric in Wales or Ireland if he would acknowledge his fault and withdraw his book on the Altar. He remained to be Laud's foe to the last.[1]

Williams was a man of strong character. Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, was weak and shallow. He appears for a long time, according to Panzani, to have been a Roman Catholic, while continuing to hold his bishopric. He was greedy and avaricious, and his intrigue and vacillation brought grave scandal upon his profession. Laud's correspondence shows the opinion he had of him: but they did not come into open conflict till the Convocation of 1640, when Goodman refused to sign the canons, which included a strong declaration against Romanism. He was at once suspended, and afterwards committed to the Tower for entering into negotiations with Rome. He died a Papist.

Two further points remain to be considered, which illustrate Laud's theory of the constitutional position of

[1] See, on the affair of Williams, his correspondence with Laud (vol. vi. of Laud's *Works*); Gardiner, vol. viii. pp. 250 *sqq.* and 390; and Perry, *History of the Church of England*, vol. i. p. 532 *sqq.* Laud's letter offering terms is Lambeth MS. 1030, fol. 68 b.

the Church, and his use of the system which he found in practical working.

The position of the Church as a separate Estate, with its own privileges, powers, and duties, was evidenced by the continuance of the ancient Convocations of Canterbury and York, which met by the royal summons at the time of each session of Parliament, voted supplies from the clerical estate, and by royal licence passed canons which had for the clergy the force of law. So long as Crown, Church, and Parliament worked together without important divergence, Convocation fulfilled no very important function, and entered very slightly, if at all, into questions of national interest. Elizabeth preserved the power of the legislative assembly of the Church unfettered by Parliamentary control, and subsequent legislation left Convocation legally subject to royal authority alone.[1] Its position appeared generally to be of little importance, judged from the standpoint of the State: it was an historical survival which was not likely to come prominently before the public view. The difficulties of Charles, the opposition of the Parliament, and the loyalty of Laud, changed all this. Convocation suddenly intervened in the midst of a political crisis, and by the assertion of its constitutional but rarely used powers tended to accentuate the difference and precipitate the contest between Crown and Parliament.

On April 13, 1640, Parliament met, and at once plunged into the discussion of the grave political questions on which the Commons were determined to resist the arbitrary government of Charles. Ship-money, grievances, the ecclesiastical "innovations," the fundamental differences that were becoming patent to

[1] Prothero, *Select Statutes Eliz. and James I.*, p. xxxv.

all—these came up in turn, and the Commons, in spite of Lords and Crown, would grant no supplies till these great matters were settled. "Till the liberties of the House and Kingdom were cleared, they knew not whether they had anything to give or no." Angry debates, the impossibility of compromise, the bold advice of Stafford, brought about the dissolution, and on May 5 the Short Parliament ceased to sit. Convocation had already sounded the note of opposition, which showed on what side the clergy would stand in the war which was growing daily nearer. On April 22 it had unanimously granted six subsidies, £20,000 a year for six years, a generous contribution to the national finances which declared that the Church approved while the Commons condemned the system of government to which Charles was committed. When Parliament was dissolved, the question at once arose as to whether Convocation could legally continue to sit. Laud had taken care to obtain the licence to enact canons,[1] which had since 1604[2] been omitted, and it was his special purpose to establish his ecclesiastical policy by the highest ecclesiastical sanction, and to present to the Parliament which claimed to control the Church the constitutional opposition of a united and legally recognized Estate.

The greatest stress was laid upon the constitutional force of the royal letters patent. "1. To reform what Convocation shall find necessary, or to put in practice disused canons needful for this time . . . 2. To satisfy the Parliament in such things as they have found, but now more than ever pretend, to stand in need of reform-

[1] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, Apr. 15, 1640.
[2] *Ibid.*, Apr. 12, p. 24.

ation in the service or discipline of the Church. It is easier for the clergy to cure their own wounds than to leave them in the hands of strangers. 3. For the assurance of all Churchmen, who either personally or representatively appear in Convocation, that the King expects them in some way, viz. in making laws, and that they do not only meet to give away their own and their brethren's money." [1] The paper of advice in which this passage occurs reveals an almost pathetic ignorance of the dangers with which the Church was beset. It appears to have seemed sufficient to Laud that he was supported by the Crown and had constitutional right. Policy or political expediency did not enter into the problem. Convocation had been summoned to do certain work, and there was no reason why it should be left undone because Parliament was dissolved. Laud seems to have doubted the legality of the continued session, but a reference to the lawyers settled the question. "The Convocation being called by the King's writ, under the Great Seal, doth continue until it be dissolved by writ or commission under the Great Seal, notwithstanding that Parliament be dissolved." A few days later, by special writs, the Convocations were continued during pleasure. Thus the constitutional rights of Convocation were vindicated. The exercise of the powers recognized was, however, a matter of greater importance. The Convocations proceeded to enact canons concerning "the regal power for suppressing the growth of popery," against "Socinians," against "sectaries" ("well knowing that there are other sects which endeavour the subversion both of the doctrine and discipline of the

[1] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, Apr. 12, 1640, p. 24.

Church of England no less than the papists do"), with other less important matters, and with two more prominent enactments which aroused the greatest opposition. The doctrine of the royal power enunciated in the first canon may more fitly be considered in relation to Laud's political opinions. There remains the declaration concerning rites, and the "etcaetera oath." [1]

The seventh canon professes to be based on the obvious desirability that "uniformity of practice in the outward worship and service of God" should accompany unity of faith. It proceeds to declare that the position of the "Communion table sideway under the east window of every chancel or chapel is in its own nature indifferent," but, quoting the injunctions of Elizabeth and the practice of the royal chapels and of "most cathedral and some parochial churches," goes on to "judge it fit and convenient that all churches and chapels do conform themselves in this particular to the example of the cathedral or mother churches, saving always the general liberty left to the bishop by law, during the administration of the Holy Communion. And we declare that this situation of the Holy Table doth not imply that it is or ought to be esteemed a true and proper altar wherein Christ is again really sacrificed; but it is, and it may be called an altar by us in that sense in which the primitive Church called it an altar, and in no other." The statement is studiously moderate. It does no more, indeed, than give to Elizabeth's injunctions the force of canonical law. It does not even prohibit the removal of the altar during the

[1] The canons, with the royal declaration, are given in Laud's *Works*, v. 607 *sqq.*

celebration of the Eucharist. Its aim is rather authoritatively to justify the action already taken by Laud's metropolitical visitation, and to express more widely than might otherwise be possible the general feeling of the Church's constitutional assembly in favour of uniformity. The significance of the doctrinal declaration must not of course be exaggerated. Its point lies in the words, "*wherein Christ is again really sacrificed*," which mark the English rejection of popular Roman teaching already condemned in the thirty-first article as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." The primitive and Catholic doctrine is expressly reserved by the statement that the term "altar" is used in the sense which the primitive Church attached to the word.

The canon goes on to direct that the altars should be "severed with rails" to preserve them from profanation, and that communicants shall "draw near and approach to the Holy Table, there to receive the divine mysteries" which are no longer to be carried "up and down by the minister," except in special cases by direction of the Ordinary, an exception still preserved at Christ Church, Oxford.

Lastly, it is adjudged "very meet and behoveful" that all good people should make reverence at coming in or going out of church—"not," it is carefully stated, "upon any opinion of a *corporal* presence of the Body of Jesus Christ on the Holy Table or in the mystical elements, but only for the advancement of God's Majesty, and to give Him alone that honour and glory that is due unto Him and no otherwise," a provision which again is based upon the Prayer-Book, and rejects only the gross and carnal conception of the Real Presence

which the Catholic Church has ever condemned. It is characteristic of the conciliatory temper in which these canons were framed that the passage concludes with a plea for mutual forbearance and charity. "In the practice or omission of this rite" (viz. of bowing) "we desire that the rule of charity prescribed by the Apostle may be observed, which is, that they which use this rite despise not them who use it not, and that they who use it not condemn not those that use it."

It is possible that so far the canons might have passed without much public comment. But it was the unhappy fashion of the age to delight to confirm its opinions by oaths. So the House of Commons, under Pym's direction, had done—and Laud regarded their action as a deliberate challenge:[1] so the Scots had done in their Covenant. It was natural that the Church should desire to have an oath from its supporters, as the national party in the Commons had from theirs. An oath was drawn up which was to be taken by all persons in holy orders, school-masters, and graduates (except sons of noblemen). It ran as follows—

"I, A. B., do swear that I do approve the doctrine, and discipline, or government established in the Church of England as containing all things necessary to salvation: and that I will not endeavour by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in any popish doctrine, contrary to that which is so established: nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this Church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, &c., as it stands now established, and as by right it ought to

[1] See Declaration, *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, Jan. 29, 1629, endorsed by Laud, "the Challenge of the Lower House in Matters of Religion."

stand, nor yet ever to subject it to the usurpations and superstitions of the See of Rome. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, or mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever. And this I do heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the faith of a Christian. So help me God in Jesus Christ." Unobjectionable as the terms of the oath might be, its form exposed it to the most damaging criticism. "Etcaetera" was at once denounced and ridiculed. What might it not cover? And how swear to support what even Convocation could not specify? It seems to have been a mere blunder. Heylin, who was very prominent in the Convocation, says the *&c.* was merely inserted to avoid repetition of a long string of officials, and was retained by carelessness when the King pressed for a rapid conclusion of the session. If a blunder, it was a most unfortunate one. It turned the laugh against the Church: and those who did not laugh thought that some popish treachery lurked behind the innocent phrases of the oath. A formidable agitation sprang up, joined even by the orthodox clergy. In a few weeks the Archbishop, by the King's order, directed that the oath should be "forborne . . . till the next ensuing Convocation." It was the first time Laud had abandoned a position he had taken up in Church matters. It was the beginning of the end.

If Convocation, a body to all seeming harmless enough, could thus stir popular feeling, how much more readily would indignation be aroused against the Court of High Commission!

Whatever may be said as to the disuse of the con-

stitutional powers of Convocation, no such objection can be urged against the High Commission.[1] It was fenced round and about by law. It had warrant for all its actions. It was the growth of no antique system of privilege, the expression of no separate right. It was a modern creation, the work of Parliament, and that almost within the memory of men living when Laud became Primate. "The group of Courts held by virtue of royal commissions issued under the Act of Supremacy" was by the time of Charles I. for all practical purposes, and except on special occasions, resolved into that "Court of High Commission" which sat in London. The duty of the Court was, especially, to enforce the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity: but in other points it trenched upon the provinces of the ancient ecclesiastical courts, which its action tended practically to supersede. Constitutionally the bishops should have acted in their own courts, and according to the rules of ecclesiastical law. Practical convenience, however, and the strong pressure of the State, which could exercise a much more direct control over the newly-created court than over those which were not tied down by recent statutes, made the High Commission assume the position of the most prominent, if not the only important, tribunal for the trial of ecclesiastical offences. It was an attempt at a short cut towards the reformation of abuses. It stood side by side with the Star Chamber and the Court of Requests. But the good accomplished was dearly purchased by the violation of constitutional right

[1] I cannot but refer to the extremely lucid and thorough account of the legal and constitutional position of this Court given by Professor Prothero, *Statutes and Documents*, &c., p. xl. *sqq.*

involved in its original creation, and the unpopularity which its procedure cast upon the Church at large.

Under Laud's primacy it proceeded against those offenders whose opinions were most strong in Parliament: nor would the lawyers, who led the party through which it was finally overthrown, ever pardon the initial infringement of constitutional balance inseparable from its existence. It was the foe of the Puritans and the bugbear of the Common Lawyers. And its creation was an unconstitutional encroachment on the rights of the clergy. These facts are sufficient to account for the general delight at its abolition. It is not necessary to invent any charges of extreme or illegal severity against its action, or to talk of a "policy of rack and thumbscrew." Probably no human institution has ever been more irrationally, or more untruthfully, attacked. Happily we have sufficient evidence to enable us to form, as Mr. Gardiner has done, an unbiassed and judicial conclusion as to its methods and its defects.

Its great defects were, in an exaggerated form, those of the other law courts of the day. They were, chiefly, the exercise of the "ex-officio oath," by which persons could be required to give evidence, in certain cases, against themselves, and the general style of browbeating and unfairness in the treatment of evidence which seems to us to be the characteristic of all the tribunals of the time. But in particular cases it is difficult to condemn the sentences given.

Happily we are able to judge of the general working of the court from the Act books, covering two years and three months, which have been preserved. "It should be remembered," says Mr. Gardiner,[1] who has made a

[1] *Hist. Engl.*, vol. x. p. 224.

classified list of the cases, "that these years begin very shortly after Laud's accession to the archbishopric, and they are therefore exactly the years in which the action of the court would be likely to be most vigorous." It will be well to examine the cases in some detail. During this period only two clergymen were sentenced to deposition from the ministry; the one for a grave moral offence, the other for teaching that Saturday should be observed as the sabbath. The sentence in the latter case was on submission wholly remitted.

Only four were sentenced to be deprived of their benefices and suspended from the exercise of their functions. The sentence of one of these, which was inflicted for nonconformity, was changed to suspension on his consenting to discuss his difficulties with his bishop, and it seems probable that it was eventually remitted. Another was guilty of dishonesty. The two others were condemned for reviling their parishioners: their suspensions were removed, in one case within six, in the other within eighteen, months.

Lastly, eight were suspended. Of these, one was allowed before long to resume his ministry, and another was wholly pardoned. Of the others, only three cases could be open to objection on any ground. John How was condemned for praying that the Prince of Wales "might not be brought up in Popery, whereof there is great cause to fear," George Burdett for preaching against the ceremonies, and Samuel Ward for a similar offence. It is obvious that no charge of undue severity can be based on these cases. If the Church was to have any discipline at all, some sanction must be attached to the acts of her constituted authorities. Judged by these sentences, the Court of High Com-

mission compares very favourably with any other court of the time.

The test may, however, be carried further. Among the mass of cases of which we have some knowledge there stand out those of Leighton, Chauncy, Ward, Barnard, Sir Giles Alington, and Lady Eleanor Davies. Leighton, whose bitter animosity against Laud has made his name famous in the annals of Nonconformity, was degraded by the High Commission before the cruel sentence of the Star Chamber was carried out. This was a natural consequence of the sentence in the other court. Chauncy had denounced the railing in of the altar in the church at Ware, of which he had formerly been minister. He "spoke reproachful words against authority, and in contempt of his Ordinary . . . and said that the rails were fit to be set up in his garden; that he came fifty miles from his own church on purpose to countenance this business. And all this he acknowledges upon his oath in his submission."[1] In his case the sentence of suspension was wholly remitted. Samuel Ward, whose subsequent career showed him to be a convinced opponent of the historic teaching of the Church, was sentenced to suspension for contemning the Book of Common Prayer.[2] He was committed to prison as contumacious, for declining to acknowledge the truth of the charges against him. His case is the most hard of those that have been preserved, for he appears to have been condemned simply for the violence of his criticism of the Laudian order. It was said that he had declared "that

[1] Laud's *Works*, iv. 232.

[2] So Laud's *Works*, v. 334. Cf. Prynne, *Cant. Doome*, p. 361; *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, 1635-6, preface.

a parrot might be instructed to repeat set forms, and that an ape might be taught to bow and gesticulate." But language such as this was certainly calculated, if not intended, to bring the Church into contempt; and it was not unnatural that the court should suspend him from the exercise of functions on which he seems to have set such little store.

Barnard [1] was severely sentenced, on the accusation of the pious and gentle Comber, Master of Trinity, for a sermon in which he categorically accused the leaders of the English Church of symbolizing with Rome, and declared that no Roman Catholic could be saved.

The cases of the laity were different. Fines and censures were awarded for open and ribald denunciation of Church ceremony or for sacrilegious acts such as that of Sherfield at Salisbury, but the great majority of the cases with which the court was concerned were moral offences. And in this Laud was unquestionably the prime mover. "If the faults and vices were fit to be looked into and discovered," says Clarendon, in one of his most luminous passages, "let the persons be who they would that were guilty of them, they were sure to find no connivance or favour from him. He intended the discipline of the Church should be felt, as well as spoken of, and that it should be applied to the greatest and most splendid transgressors as well as to the punishment of smaller offences and meaner offenders; and thereupon called for or cherished the discovery of those who were not careful to cover their own iniquities, thinking they were above the

[1] His case is given in Prynne, *Cant. Doome*, p. 364 *sqq.*, but it is difficult to rely upon its accuracy; and in Laud's *Works*, iv. 302.

reach of other men, or their power or will to chastise. Persons of honour and great quality, of the Court and of the country, were every day cited into the High Commission Court, upon the fame of their incontinence, or other scandal in their lives, and were there prosecuted to their shame and punishment: and as the shame (which they called an insolent triumph upon their degree and quality, and levelling them with the common people) was never forgotten, but watched for revenge, so the fines imposed there were the more questioned and repined against, because they were assigned to the rebuilding and repairing of S. Paul's church, and thought therefore to be the more severely imposed, and the less compassionately reduced and excused."

"In questions relating to marriage the court struggled," says Mr. Gardiner, "against every kind of opposition, to uphold the standard of a high morality." Frances Coke, the wife of Buckingham's coarse and half-witted brother, Lord Purbeck, had left him, and lived in adultery with Sir Robert Howard. The High Commission issued an order for a separation, and enjoined upon the lady a public penance. She evaded the penance, and after some years ventured to return to London with her paramour. She was at once imprisoned, and the penance was required to be performed. She escaped before the day arrived. The sentence showed a courageous desire to deal with vice in high places. As great a scandal was that of Sir Giles Alington, who married his own niece. He was summoned before the High Commission, but by playing upon the jealousy of the Common lawyers secured a prohibition from the Common Pleas. The

High Commission took no heed, and gave a sentence of £12,000 fine. Laud spoke bravely, "If this prohibition had taken place, I hope my Lord's Grace of Canterbury would have excommunicated throughout his province all the judges who should have had a hand therein. For mine own part, I will assure you, if he would not I would have done it in my diocese, and myself in person denounced it, both in Paul's church and other churches of the same, against the authors of so enormous a scandal to our Church and religion." "It was spoken," said an observer, "like a bishop indeed." [1]

The case of Lady Eleanor Davies stands by itself. She was a lunatic, but of sufficient sanity to cause a great deal of trouble, and it was long before the courts would recognize her as mad. She wrote bad verses and made foolish prophecies, and was delighted with an anagram which made her name produce, "Reveale o Daniel." Sir John Lambe told her that a better anagram was "Never so mad a Ladie." She was fined £3000 and imprisoned. Not content with this, she identified Laud with the Beast of the Apocalypse, and prophesied his decease within a month. Laud, however, was not concerned with her trial, and took her revelations very lightly.[2] A few years later her madness broke out again, and she entered Lichfield Cathedral "with a kettle in one hand and a brush in the other to sprinkle some of her holy water (as she called that in the kettle) upon the (altar) hangings and the bishop's seat, which was only a composition of tar,

[1] Sir Robert was fined for aiding her escape. It is a curious comment on Puritanism, that Laud was by the Long Parliament ordered to pay him £500 for false imprisonment.

[2] See his letter to Strafford, *Works*, vi. 331-3.

pitch, sink-puddle water, &c., and such kind of nasty ingredients." After this she was, none too soon, removed to Bedlam.

The volume[1] of reports of cases taken from the Harleian and Rawlinson MSS. gives illustrations of Laud's action in the High Commission Court at an earlier period, from October 1631 to June 1632. None of the cases are of any great interest, but they serve as excellent examples of the ordinary work of the court. Gross libel charges and moral offences appear side by side with measures for the preservation of decency in worship and the suppression of conventicles. Laud appears severe on occasion, but by no means more severe than Abbot; and he shows the strong sense of justice and the shrewd acuteness in grasping points of importance which we have learnt to look for. Of the recusancy fines he said in the Star Chamber very truly, "52 shillings a year is no persecution."[2] Yet when Roman vestments were seized he insisted that their full value should be paid.[3] Against the seats in churches above the altar he waged strenuous war, "You must not prepare your seats above God."[4]

From such cases, and such illustrations, we may draw a fair picture of the ordinary work of the High Commission. "No one," says the great living authority on this period, "who has studied its records will speak of it as a barbarous or even a cruel tribunal." In its treatment of moral offences it was severe, but no more severe than the times imperatively demanded. Its conscientious and courageous defence of the purity of

[1] *Reports of Cases in the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission*, edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, LL.D. Camden Society, 1886.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 105. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 196. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 296.

the marriage tie, and of the cause of injured women, shows that the King's party was at least as much alive as its opponents to the moral evils of the age. In its action with regard to conformity, a careful examination shows it to have rarely outstepped the most moderate punishments which the offences allowed.

With regard to Laud's own position in the court, it must not be forgotten that all through his trial, though he defended the sentences in particular cases, he steadfastly repudiated all responsibility beyond that for his own vote. "All this is the act of the High Commission, not mine."[1] "In the High Commission we meddled with no cause not cognizable there . . . and meddling with nothing but things proper to them, I conceive no one man can be singled out to suffer for that which was done by all." The Archbishop's vote was not given generally till last, and he again and again declared that he never influenced another man's decision. He was never hasty to condemn, and always ready to defer judgment, or to confer with nonconforming ministers himself, on the chance of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion.[2] His action will well bear a comparison with that of his Puritan predecessor, Abbot.

From the High Commission, in which his action belongs at least as much to his position as to his character, it is pleasant to pass to Laud's relations with the Universities.

[1] *Works*, iv. 232, 235.

[2] See Letter of Dr. W. Yonge to Laud, Oct. 19, 1631 (*Cal. State Papers*)—Concerning some ministers that refused to subscribe and conform, the writer is a witness of the bishop's patient forbearing them, giving them time to consult conformable ministers, and vouchsafing to confer with them himself. Nor has he ever heard that any have been deprived but such as utterly refused to conform.

Few of Laud's many interests lay nearer to his heart than his love of learning. It was his great wish to see the English Church the home of a learned clergy. While the Reformation and the Renaissance which accompanied it in England had tended to raise the standard of education throughout the country, the difficulty of providing clergy, under the new circumstances, had resulted in the advance in the learning of the clerical estate being slower, in proportion, than in that of the more leisured classes. It was, for the time, exceptionally difficult to be both a priest and a scholar. A life of learning was difficult when the moral and intellectual demands upon the clergy were so great. Laud, who owed himself so much to his college training, and retained perhaps all his life something of the characteristics of a college don, was especially eager to encourage the work of the Universities in its relation to the general work of the Church. When he ceased to reside in Oxford, he did not abate his interest in the University or in his own college. To S. John's he was a constant benefactor. Year by year he sent down books and MSS. to the college library. Many magnificent folios stamped with the arms of Canterbury and of Laud still recall his generosity to his old college. Most of them are rare editions, or valuable copies of classical authors, and many are elaborately illustrated books. The bindings are in every case of beautiful workmanship, ranging from finely-tooled morocco to plain velvet. One of his choicest gifts was the *Whole Law of Moses*, from Little Gidding, bound in purple velvet.[1] Still more precious were his gifts of MSS.

[1] Not, as Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian*, 2nd edit., p. 67, in green.

These began as early as 1610, when he was still Fellow, and continued till the close of his life. He presented to S. John's in all thirty MSS., of which a large number are in Oriental languages. Many of these doubtless reached him through the Turkey Company, in consequence of the King's order of February 1634, that "every ship of that company at every voyage shall bring home one Arabic or Persian MS. book, to be delivered to the master of the Company, and by him to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who shall dispose of them as the King shall think fit." [1] Pococke too had opened relations with the Patriarch of Constantinople, and another agent, Graves, was collecting in Egypt.

To the Bodleian library, as to his own college, he was a generous benefactor. In 1629 he procured from his old friend, Sir Thomas Roe, who had been ambassador at Constantinople, many valuable MSS. Through him the Barocci MSS. were presented by the Earl of Pembroke, his predecessor as Chancellor of the University, and the 238 MSS. collected by Thomas Allen were given by Sir Kenelm Digby. In 1635 and 1636 he was especially generous in benefaction. He gave in the first year 462 volumes of MSS. and five rolls. Among these were some of the spoils of Würtzburg, taken by the Swedes in the Thirty Years' War. To these in 1636 he added 181 MSS. and five cabinets of coins. In 1639 he gave nearly 600 MSS., and in the last year of his Chancellorship he sent many more, with a pathetic letter in which the dangers of the times are bewailed. His whole benefaction consisted of over 1300 MSS. in twelve languages, very largely "spolia Orientis," as the University declared. Few, if any, gifts

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, 1633-34, p. 477.

of more value have ever been received by a great library, and none, it may be safely said, display so clearly at once the generosity and the discernment of the giver. The Bodleian Library, as well as S. John's College, is an abiding memorial of the greatest prelate that the University has produced since the Reformation.[1]

In the midst of the multifarious interests by which he was surrounded, Laud always retained his close connection with Oxford. When he ceased to reside he was kept constantly informed of the doings of the University. Juxon, his successor at S. John's, was his regular correspondent. Baylie, whom he had promoted on every occasion, often brought him the latest news, and, as his chaplain, served to bind him still to the society that he loved. And he had always kept up his affection for his "old friend" Sir William Paddy.

It had always been the custom for the University to elect as Chancellor some prominent nobleman whose support could be relied upon. When, in 1630, the Earl of Pembroke died, it was felt that Laud was at once the most prominent patron and the most generous benefactor whom the University could honour by its choice. He was elected to the vacant post on April 12, and threw himself at once into the discharge of its duties with his accustomed energy. One of his first thoughts was for his own college. S. John's was a very small society, and its buildings were still, with but slight additions, those of the old Cistercian house which had been purchased by the founder, Sir Thomas White. Already the college was feeling cramped in its small habitation. Laud wished to attract the sons of dis-

[1] Mr. Macray's classical *Annals of the Bodleian* contains a full account of Laud's benefactions to the Library.

tinguished men. The old buildings did not seem to afford proper accommodation. The President's house, too, was small compared to those of the other heads whose equal he had now become. Laud determined, in November 1630, "to build at S. John's in Oxford, where I was bred up, for the good and safety of that college." He set about the work with characteristic precision. He procured from the King a grant of timber from the forests of Stow and Shotover: the rest of the work came entirely from his own generosity. It is supposed that the plans were the work of Inigo Jones: the design was at least new to Oxford, and marked, if it did not originate, a departure in English architecture.

Beyond the old buildings, one side of a quadrangle was already erected. It had been completed as a library in 1596. Laud finished the court. Facing the college groves he built the exquisite "garden front," which is one of the most beautiful features of Oxford as we know it. Taking the east end of the already existing library as a model, the architect with extraordinary skill produced a long façade in which suggestions of classical style were harmoniously mingled with the late Perpendicular domestic architecture of the original. The work is well worthy of detailed examination. The plan of the interior of the quadrangle was at the time unique. At the east and west sides were built cloisters of purely Renaissance design, in the style so familiar at Bologna and elsewhere in Italy, but hitherto unknown in England. Above the cloisters were the long gallery added to the President's house and the "new library" which Laud provided for the books which he was constantly sending down to his old college. The cloisters,

wrote Juxon,[1] were "of the largest size that art can allow, and the pillars of the best stone, under marble, growing (*sic*) in that part of England. The cloisters," he added, were "of a form not yet seen in Oxford (for that under Jesus College Library is a misfeatured thing)."

The work, begun in 1631, was completed in 1636. The total cost of the building appears to have been £3,208 4*s.* 3*d.*[2] Laud added two bronze statues of Charles and Henrietta Maria, life size, the work of Hubert Le Sueur, the cost of which was £400.[3] The work when completed may be said to have placed the college architecturally in the front rank even among the artistic glories of Oxford: and the effect upon the status of the foundation, which Laud's work had in other ways tended to raise, was marked. The new buildings were the completion of the work of the "second founder," which gave to Sir Thomas White's college, for a time, the leading place in the University. Well might the President and Fellows exceed the language of academic eulogy, and declare that "if their gratitude were mute, the very stones of their college would, like the statue of Memnon, commemorated by Tacitus, give forth music to his glory."[4]

The new buildings were opened on the occasion of a visit of the King and Queen.[5] Laud as the Chancellor of the University welcomed the royal party with elaborate

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, March 12, 1632.

[2] Dr. R. Baylie to Laud, *Cal. State Papers*, April 23, 1636. See also *Cal. State Papers*, April 16, 1631, March 12, 1632, March 19, 1632, October 31, 1633, November 28, 1633, &c.

[3] See *Cal. State Papers*, May 2, 1633, and May 3, 1634.

[4] *Cal. State Papers*, April 15, 1631.

[5] See Hist. of Chancellorship, *Works*, v. 144 *sqq.*

ceremonial. It was a memorable year for S. John's and for Laud. On March 6, Juxon, then Bishop of London, and formerly President, had been made Lord High Treasurer of England. In June, Laud had established his right to visit both Universities *jure metropolitico*, and had completed his revision of the statutes and promulgated the new code. Dr. Baylie, the President of S. John's, was the Vice-Chancellor. The royal visit lasted from the 29th to the 31st of August. The King, as usual, resided in Christ Church,[1] and the customary speeches and sermons were delivered. The Elector Palatine and Prince Rupert, sons of Charles's unhappy sister Elizabeth, received honorary degrees, and their names were entered on the books of S. John's. Laud gave a brief and happy Latin speech in Convocation, in the style of all academic discourses, complimenting the princes, eulogizing the University, and jesting at his own disuse of the learned language. But the most prominent feature of the royal sojourn was the visit to S. John's.

On Tuesday the 30th ("it was S. Felix his day," Laud, with his love of good omens, notes in his diary, "and all passed happily") the King and Queen came to the Chancellor's college. "When they were come to S. John's they first viewed the new building, and, that done, I attended them up the library stairs; where, so soon as they began to ascend, the music began, and they had a fine short song fitted for them as they ascended the stairs." When they had passed through the door, over which the King's bust (most probably by Le Sueur)

[1] The current Oxford legend that he stayed at S. John's has no foundation, nor is there any reason why the rooms at the end of Laud's library should be called "King Charles's rooms."

now stands, they entered the old library which Sir Thomas White had begun, and the Merchant Taylors' Company had helped to complete. This was the room most used for private study, and the book-shelves were fitted with desks at which the great folios could be read. There, one of the Fellows, Abraham Wright, welcomed them with a speech. Then, continues Laud, "dinner being ready, they passed from the old into the new library, built by myself, where the King, the Queen, and the Prince Elector dined at one table, which stood cross at the upper end. And Prince Rupert, with all the lords and ladies present, which were very many, dined at a long table in the same room. All other several tables, to the number of thirteen besides these two, were disposed in several chambers of the college, and had several men appointed to attend them; and I thank God I had that happiness, that all things were in very good order, and that no man went out at the gates, courtier or other, but content; which was a happiness quite beyond expectation."

We learn from an Oxford diarist that "the baked meats served up in S. John's were so contrived by the cook that there was first the forms of archbishops, then bishops, doctors, &c., seen in order, wherein the King and courtiers took much content." It was, says a letter-writer, "a mighty feast." [1]

"When dinner was ended," Laud continues, "I attended the King and the Queen together with the nobles into several withdrawing chambers,[2] where they

[1] George Garrard, to Edward Lord Conway, September 4, 1636 (*Cal. State Papers*, 1636-7, p. 113).

[2] It is probable that the room at the north end of the library, which then very likely opened into it, and the rooms from thence

entertained themselves for the space of an hour. And in the meantime I caused the windows of the hall to be shut, the candles lighted, and all things made ready for the play to begin. When these things were fitted, I gave notice to the King and the Queen, and attended them into the hall, whither I had the happiness to bring them by a way prepared from the President's lodging to the hall without any the least disturbance: and had the hall kept as fresh and cool, that there was not any one person when the King and Queen came into it. The princes, nobles, and ladies entered the same way with the King, and then presently another door was opened below to fill the hall with the better sort of company, which being done the play was begun and acted." It was *Love's Hospital*, written by George Wilde, one of the Fellows, who after the Restoration became Bishop of Derry. "The plot was very good, and the action. It was merry, and without offence, and so gave a great deal of content." S. John's had long been a home of acting, since the time when the *Christmas Prince* had been the envy of the University, and Laud adds with pride that "the college was at that time so well furnished that they did not borrow any one actor from any college in town." When the play was over, the King and Queen returned to Christ Church; and the next day they left Oxford, with "a great deal of thanks." On the evening of the 31st, Laud gave a dinner in his new library to the heads of colleges, doctors, and proctors, "which gave the University a great deal of content, being that which had never been done by any Chancellor before. I sat with them," he

to the President's house, which were then all connected, were used as "withdrawing rooms" on this occasion.

says, "at table, we were merry, and very glad that all things had so passed to the great satisfaction of the King, and the honour of that place."

The whole entertainment, which had been given on a munificent scale—for Laud, though simple in his own tastes, could on occasion emulate the historic grandeur of the medieval bishops—cost the Archbishop £2,666.[1] His careful steward, Adam Torless, remained at Oxford a week to collect the accounts and pay the bills, while Laud himself, with a retinue of "between forty and fifty horse," returned by slow stages to Croydon. It was the last time he was in Oxford, and the University gave fit recognition of his generosity and care.

The same minute care, and the same munificence, appear in his general treatment of the University, as in his patronage of his own college and of the Bodleian Library. This will be seen from a brief review of his Chancellorship.

He was admitted to office at London House on April 28, 1630, after a large number of representatives of the University had assembled in Convocation at Doctors' Commons, and marched in procession to the bishop's palace. Laud's speech, after taking the oaths, was a modest recognition of inferiority to his predecessors in position, but clearly expressed his intention not to regard the office as a sinecure. His intimate knowledge of the University and the city enabled him to do more for both than had been done for centuries. Three points appeared to him especially to require attention. He was convinced of the necessity of

[1] Account made by A. Torless, *Cal. State Papers*, 1636-7, p. 477. Many presents were received, and some great personages also gave contributions. Laud has added to the endorsement, "all payed."

personal supervision from outside, in order to prevent petty quarrels—he saw the necessity for a revival of discipline among the undergraduates, and a revision of the statutes.

From the first he required the Vice-Chancellor to send him weekly an account of University affairs, upon which he promised to send every week his own censure or approbation. He kept a book, it is clear, into which the University letters and his replies were copied, and in which he noted down all events of importance as they occurred.[1] From this it is evident that he had no easy post. The Regius and Margaret Professors of Divinity[2] needed admonition to "read their lectures as the statutes require": the proctors' authority required support even against the Dean of Christ Church[3] (whom Laud in 1639 sharply informed that he had "carried this business like a sudden, hasty, and weak man, and most unlike a man that understands government"): Dr. Prideaux had to be continually rated for unsound doctrine and ill manners; the Westminster supper at Christ Church on December 20 deserved suppression as a cause of disorder: the cellar of Brasenose required to be "better looked to, that no strong and unruly argument be drawn from that topic place": the citizens quarrelled with the University about the night-watch—a traditional quarrel

[1] This volume appears to have come, with other Laud MSS., to S. John's, and was lent by Dr. Peter Mews, President 1667—1673, to Antony Wood, since which time it has not been heard of. See Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses*, vol. iii. p. 141. It was published in 1700, and in vol. v. of his *Works*, 1853.

[2] Dr. John Prideaux, Reg. Prof. Div. 1615—1642; Dr. Samuel Fell, Marg. Prof. 1626—1638, and Dean of Ch. Ch. 1638-1647.

[3] There is an interesting passage in relation to contested questions of University jurisdiction (v. 279).

—and the Chancellor must make peace: the Mitre, ever a famous inn, was declared to be "the general rendezvous of all the recusants, not in this shire only, but in the kingdom": and the Winchester scholars of New College required to be checked in too early reading of Calvin.[1] In all these matters Laud personally intervened, and he was no less interested in the regulation of alehouses, the navigation of the Thames, the discovery of recusants, and the addition of new buildings to the colleges.[2]

To the Church and learning he rendered conspicuous services in the revival of the Latin celebration of the Holy Communion at the beginning of each term in the University church, and in the creation of an Arabic lectureship,[3] to which he appointed Mr. Edward Pococke, the most famous Orientalist of the day. He was especially concerned also in the development of the "learned" press, and it was through him that the prebend of Christ Church was annexed to the chair of Hebrew. Besides these services, under his Chancellorship, Oxford was most immediately affected by the reinforcement of discipline and the revision of the statutes.

The studies of the place could not be properly carried on when the government of the students was so lax as Laud found it. In 1631 he issued orders to check the extravagance of apparel, the "boots and spurs together with their gowns," which the young men affected, and to enforce the due respect of juniors towards seniors.

[1] "I have often wondered," he says (v. 116), "why so many good scholars came from Winchester to New College, and yet so few of them afterwards prove eminent men."

[2] He notes the new building of the west side of University College in 1634.

[3] Now the Laudian Professorship of Arabic.

The statutes were to be put in force "for haunting of inns or taverns, especially of masters of arts, that should give younger youths better example." The next year similar injunctions were issued, that the heads of colleges should see that the youth conform themselves to the public discipline of the University. "And particularly I pray, see that none, youth or other, be suffered to go in boots or spurs, or to wear their hair undecently long, or with a lock in the present fashion, or with slashed doublets, or in any light or garish colours." Laud's intimate knowledge of the University had given him a scheme for its improvement as well as the understanding of its disciplinary defects. He desired especially to make the power of the Chancellor more real, and secondly, to exercise that power, through the heads of houses, over all members of the University. His idea of his own function made the Chancellor in Oxford something of what the Lord Mayor was in London; and as the guilds and companies were amenable through their masters and wardens, so were the graduates and undergraduates through the body of heads. Tact and a strong hand soon re-establish discipline: and by 1636, Mr. Secretary Coke could congratulate the students on the revival of studious manners, and states that the University in this matter, "which before had no paragon in any foreign country," had now "gone beyond itself."

Of more permanent importance even than the reassertion of authority was the codification of statutes which was the great work of Laud's Chancellorship. In University law he found confusion worse confounded. Twice during his residence it had been attempted to bring into order the multitudinous and contradictory

rules by which the University was governed almost at haphazard. He had himself been on a delegacy appointed to deal with the matter, and when he became Chancellor he took up the question with spirit. A delegacy was again appointed, and by 1633 it reported that its work was done. On August 20 the draft was submitted to the Chancellor. He undertook a careful revision of the whole, and issued the result on July 18, 1634, enjoining that the statutes should be observed for a year, and at the end of that time be published with any alterations that in the meantime might appear to be necessary.[1]

The Laudian Code, as it came to be called, marked an epoch in University law. The casual and temporary orders of the Middle Age and of the Revival of Learning had lain down together in poor harmony. It was possible for a pedantic student or an ill-disposed agitator to delay business and reduce government to an absurdity. Convocation was constantly called together, and the "whole University" was troubled "for every boy's business." Laud introduced system and coherence. He gave the government to a Board of Heads, who should meet weekly to "consider of the peace and government of the University as occasion may arise." He substituted for the unsatisfactory method of choosing proctors by general election a choice by the colleges according to a definite cycle. It was under his direction also that examinations were instituted, "including far more subjects than are now required of passmen."[2] Throughout, he defined rights and regulated duties. The Laudian Code remained in force

[1] See the *Laudian Statutes*, ed. Griffith and Shadwell, 1888.
[2] Brodrick, *Memorials of Merton College*, p. 77, note.

with but slight changes till the modern era of legislation set in, and even now in matters of ceremonial and of discipline it forms the basis of University rule. There is no need to exaggerate Laud's personal influence on the codification. He knew what it was necessary to do; he employed capable agents, and he supervised their work when it was accomplished. The result bore markedly the impress of his mind. But he did not, in any general sense, create or originate; his wisdom lay rather in the adaptation and in the intention. Nevertheless, his work was one of the most valuable and the most permanent that the University has known. He was a genuine University reformer, and in that aspect of his life he might be content to go down to posterity with his code in his hand.

Apart from his position as Chancellor, Laud exercised considerable control over several of the colleges in the capacity of visitor. The most famous instance of the use of these powers was in the case of Merton College, where the statutes were by no means scrupulously obeyed, and where Laud determined to enforce a "godly and thorough reformation." The ordinances issued as the result of his visitation were extremely strict and entered into every aspect of college life. Sir Nathaniel Brent, the warden, accepted them with apparent submission, but it is clear that the college as a whole preferred to govern itself, however laxly, for it regarded the Archbishop's action as "the most unjust of visitations and worse than the worst of all."[1]

It is characteristic of the man, that he was not satisfied with the *rapprochement* which his individual knowledge and affection might bring about between the

[1] See Brodrick's *Memorials of Merton College.*

Church and the Universities. He sought to make permanent and inalienable the right of the Church to supervise the higher education of the nation. He saw in the vague power with which law and custom had endowed the see of Canterbury a means of exercising a lawful and extensive control. He therefore claimed the right to visit the Universities as inherent in the metropolitanate. He claimed the right as ecclesiastical not academic, and intended in no way to interfere with the statutes.[1] He collected evidence, papers, decrees, precedents, in favour of his claim. The Universities also stated their case,[2] as did certain colleges with regard to separate foundations, and a decision was finally given by the King in Council, June 21, 1636. "After a statement of the case, and of the principal objections with the counter-evidence in support of the asserted right, his Majesty adjudged the right of visiting both the Universities to belong to the archbishops and metropolitical Church of Canterbury, and that the Universities should be from time to time obedient thereunto." The right thus asserted was never exercised. "My troubles began to be foreseen by me, and I visited them not," said Laud at his trial, when the claim was made the matter of a formal charge against him.[3]

His relations with the Universities—and the history of his Chancellorship of Trinity College, Dublin,[4] is as valuable an illustration of his aims as any branch of his

[1] See letter of Dr. Chr. Potter, *Cal. State Papers*, June 24, 1635.

[2] Oxford made no general opposition; for the case of Cambridge, see Laud's *Works*, v. 555 *sqq.*

[3] *Works*, iv. 193.

[4] See p. 166 *sqq.*

English work—must be regarded as one aspect, and that to him a very important one, of his rights and duties with regard to the Church at large. True religion and sound learning ever stood together in his thoughts as they stood in the Bidding Prayer of his own University. It was his aim to knit them still more firmly, and to encourage the progress of learning by the aid of the moral principles which it belonged to religion to instil. All intellectual progress requires training and submission to rule, but opinion was to be shackled as little as possible by minute dogmatic regulations. What Church and State had decided and declared must of course be observed: but it had been their wisdom but rarely to descend into particulars. As for the Universities, so for the Church at large, obedience and freedom did not seem to Laud to be incompatible. That union, rejected though it might be for the time, was yet imperatively demanded by Church and State alike. And so it was that "his nobler aims were too much in accordance with the needs of his age to be altogether baffled." It may be "little that every parish church in the land still—two centuries and a half after the years in which he was at the height of power—presents a spectacle which realizes his hopes; it is far more that his refusal to submit his mind to the dogmatism of Puritanism, and his appeal to the cultivated intelligence for the solution of religious problems, has received an ever-increasing response, even in regions in which his memory is devoted to contemptuous obloquy."[1] It is in this that Laud's claim to be a far-sighted statesman may be justified. Narrow though his outlook may appear to have been, he was in reality

[1] Gardiner, *Hist. of Great Civil War*, vol. ii. p. 108.

builder, like all the true artificers of the Church, for futurity. Thus, through his love of order and his love of learning, no less than by his energy and his tolerance, he did for the Church of England a work which no other man since the Reformation has been able to achieve.

CHAPTER IV.

LAUD AND THE STATE.

LAUD, by the neeessities of the time more than by his own wish, was a statesman as well as an ecclesiastic. It is true that he saw no objection to the employment of priests in secular office: rather he considered that they could do work, in their single-minded devotion to duty and absence of family interest, which the politicians of the time but rarely accomplished. But it was not to him an ideal arrangement. When he secured the elevation of Juxon to be Lord Treasurer, he had satisfied himself of the fitness of the appointment, not only by a careful search for precedents, but by an examination of the merits of other possible candidates. He had himself worked at the Treasury, and had seen the difficulties of its management and the need of the strictest probity. "He had observed," says Heylin, "that divers Treasurers of late years had raised themselves from very mean and private fortunes to the titles and estates of earls, which he conceived could not be without wrong to both King and subjects, and therefore he resolved to commend such a man to

his Majesty for the next Lord Treasurer, who, having no family to raise, no wife and children to provide for, might better manage the incomes of the Treasury to the King's advantage than they had been formerly."

Some benefit he looked for to the Church from the arrangement. "No churchman had it since Henry VII.'s time. I pray God bless him to carry it so that the Church may have honour, and the King and the State service and contentment by it. And now, if the Church will not hold themselves up under God, I can do no more," he wrote in his Diary on March 6, 1636; and he made no further attempts to place Churchmen in State office. As Primate, he was himself, according to ancient usage, the first constitutional adviser of the Crown, and that his interference in the affairs of government should be sought by Charles was not unnatural. But before this date he was already, through Buckingham's influence, engaged in secular work. If we enumerate the secular employments in which he was at any time engaged, we find that he was a privy councillor, and sat on the High Commission and in the Star Chamber; he was on the Commissions of the Treasury and of the Admiralty; he was on the Foreign Committee and the Committee of Trade. His capacity for hard work and his utter absence of all self-seeking, made the King, who came gradually to rely greatly upon his advice, naturally put him wherever he might be useful.

Like all men who are set to work for which they have no special aptitude or training, he was by no means always wise or successful in affairs of State. He imparted a new spirit to the Treasury by his keen search into abuses and his complete freedom from

selfish aims. But, to take one instance, his treatment of the questions involved in the soap monopoly was injudicious though well-meaning; and the quarrel with Cottington and Windebanke, which followed, seriously increased the difficulties of his own position. It was an advantage to have an honest man in office, but it was a misfortune to give authority in business matters to one who was in no way a financier. Laud chafed against "my lady Mora," the curse of the whole administration: he threw himself headlong into the struggle against corrupt and dishonest advisers: but he was unfit for the work, and he could do little at it.[1]

His practical work, however, it may be said, was less important than his political theory. It was Laud, above all men, it has often been asserted, who threw the weight of the Church on to the side of absolutism in the great struggle. In a sense this is true, but it is true to a much more limited extent than has been generally believed. Laud was an Aristotelian.[2] He looked at government from a practical standpoint, and, like Hooker, took much of his political principles from the Ethics and the Politics. He had certainly no idea of advising a policy that was contrary to law. "I learned so much long ago out of Aristotle," he said at his trial, "and his reasons are too good to be gone against." Thus the benefit of the governed was the

[1] This is not the opinion of Mr. Simpkinson, *Life of Laud*, who dwells upon Laud's political activity, his work at the Treasury and the Admiralty, and his preparations for the Scots war. I do not think, however, that the authorities warrant our ascribing so much to the Archbishop's individual action.

[2] He constantly quotes Aristotle, whom he calls his "old master" at his trial.

thought which underlay all his statements of political doctrine. He had no taste for abstract speculation, least of all in politics. The doctrine of the Divine right of kings, as Mr. Gardiner says, never assumed prominence in his mind. He thought, like so many sober students of the time, that government needed a firmer base than the will of a fickle and half-educated people, and he accepted the theory which Anglican controversialists had found so valuable an ally in their resistance to papal claims. Thus the expression of the canons of 1640 follows the lines of Bodin, whom Laud himself on several occasions quotes as an authority, as well as of Hooker. "The most high and sacred order of kings is of Divine right, being the ordinance of God Himself, founded in the prime laws of nature, and clearly established by express texts both of the Old and New Testaments."

The regal authority is recognized as supreme, and the definition of the supremacy is a definite approach to the formal statement of the doctrine of sovereignty, as later developed by Hobbes. "For any person to set up, maintain, or avow . . . . any independent co-active power, either papal or popular . . . . is to undermine their great royal office." Behind the King lies the divine sanction. Thus, bearing arms against the sovereign is declared to be to resist the ordinance of God. "Bodin," as Laud said at his trial, "is clear that arms may not be taken up against the prince, be he never so impious and wicked, and instances in Saul and Nebuchadnezzar."

In all this Laud certainly never dreamed that he was passing beyond existing law and custom. He was fortified by legal decisions at every point of dispute.

And when a rash preacher like Manwaring[1] went beyond what seemed to him just, he protested against the publication of his sermon. "I have, since I came into place, made stay of divers books, purposely written to maintain 'an absolute power' in the kingdom, and have not suffered them to be printed, as were earnestly desired," he said at his trial. He declared to the last that he had never favoured arbitrary government. The law might be sharply or lightly carried out, but it should never be exceeded. And this, he declared, "I learned of a very wise and able governor . . . . Henry VII., of whom the story says that in the difficulties of his time and cause, he used both ways of government, severity and clemency, yet both these were still within the compass of the law. He was far too wise, and I never yet such a fool, as to embrace arbitrary government."

The critical question of taxation is avoided in the canons of 1640 by an assertion of the royal right to supplies, coupled with a declaration of the subject's right to his own property. And Laud in his appeals to individuals and to the nation in the matter of ship-money relied solely on the judge's decision. As in Church, so in State, a decision of the constituted authority was to him final. "I for my part could not conceive that the judges would put that under their hands to be law which should after be found unlawful." He made indeed a special search for precedents in the matter of parliamentary grants, as may be seen in a list

[1] I venture to think that Mr. Gardiner (vi. 208) exaggerates Manwaring's teaching. He did not assert that "eternal damnation" would be the lot of those who did not obey the King. He used the term "damnation" simply in the sense in which it is used in the Authorized Version in the passage referred to.

of Parliaments on which he has noted the gifts and subsidies on each occasion.[1]

Thus his sermons appeal to the existing constitution as the ground for generosity and for unity on the part of Parliament. States have their solidity only in the unity of those who compose them—it is his constant appeal, and an appeal which illustrates the scope of his political vision. He was content to take the constitution as he found it, and to accept for fundamental bases of the State all the powers that the despotic Tudors had exercised. He did not deny the competence of other forms of government—but the monarchical was to him at once the best and for England the permanent.

"I have no will to except against any form of government, assumed by any state; yet this my text bids me say for the honour of monarchical government, the 'seats of judgment' in it are permanent; and I do not remember that ever I read 'seats of judgment' so fixed as under regal power. I do not by this deny but that there may be the city in peace and administration of justice in other forms of government, sometimes as much, sometimes more; but these are *judicia* not *sedes*, 'judgment' not 'seats,' of it. And justice there may be; but it continues not half so steady. The factions of an aristocracy, how often have they divided the city into civil wars, and made that city which was 'at unity in itself' wade in her own blood! And for a democracy, or popular government, *fluctus populi fluctus maris*, the waves and gulfs of both are alike. None but God can 'rule the raging of the sea

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, March 17, 1628. Part of it is printed in his *Works*, vii. 627 *sqq.*

and the madness of the people.' And no safety or settledness till there be a return in *domum David*, to a monarchy and a King again." [1]

The King as a settled foundation, and "you are a noble and most loyal people"—such are his fundamental conceptions. They belong to the England of Elizabeth, to the romantic, extravagant veneration in which the woman and the Queen, the person and the State, were confused. They sound antiquated and irrelevant in the England of the Stewarts. And yet, out of date as was the entire personal devotion of the sixteenth century, it was this—to which Laud appealed, and which seemed to him to be a beautiful and natural feature of human society,—which under the influence of the Church gave Charles the party that fought so gallantly for his cause. Old-fashioned loyalties have a power which the world can ill afford to lack : and these it was the work of Laud and the Churchmen of his day to foster and preserve. The strength of the Crown lay largely in that union between Church and State which Laud believed to be indispensable. Church and State stand and fall together—it is his constant teaching. "The Church cannot dwell but in the State": "and the Commonwealth cannot flourish without the Church." And though he follows Aristotle as to the origin of the State, he denies the possibility of the existence of the State in its perfection without the Church to make it "blessed and happy." And by the Church he definitely meant the Church as organized upon the Apostolic model. This Catholic Church it was which was inseparably bound to solid government, and above all to

[1] Sermon before King Charles's second Parliament, *Works*, i. 85.

monarchy. "They, whoever they be, that would overthrow *sedes ecclesiae*, the 'seats of ecclesiastical government,' will not spare, if ever they get power, to have a pluck at 'the throne of David.' And there is not a man that is for 'parity'—all fellows in the Church—but he is not for monarchy in the State." Laud saw quite as clearly as James I. that "no bishop" involved "no king."

And yet, though it lay at the very root of his political creed to accept the constitution as he found it, and to serve the monarch with unreserved loyalty and devotion, neither theory nor practice made him blind to the defects of government or the personal weaknesses of the King. "The secret lets and difficulties in public proceedings," he said, following Hooker, "and in the managing of great State affairs, are both 'innumerable and inevitable'; and this every discreet man should consider." And of Charles his deliberate judgment—forced on him, it is true, after years of bitter disappointment and tragic experience—remains, "a mild and gracious prince who knew not how to be or to be made great." Something of this feeling, perhaps, urged him earlier, when he begged the people to pray for the King,[1] for men do not readily revile and murmur against one whom they earnestly remember before God.

Such was Laud's attitude towards the Crown. It did not involve such disparagement of Parliaments as the more violent Monarchists found ready to their hands, or such exaltation of the royal authority. The charge against him of altering the Coronation oath entirely broke down at the trial, and was abandoned by Prynne himself, who had garbled the Diary in order

[1] *Works*, i. 191.

to find a basis for it. The oath which Charles took was the same as that taken by his father.[1] Laud was the last man in the world to alter custom on such a point and at such a time. And he fully admitted the place of Parliament in the Constitution, though it would be hard to discover to what extent he recognized or limited its powers. He supported Strafford in his advice to summon the House in December 1639. "Parliaments are the best preservers of the ancient laws and rights of this kingdom," he said, "but I think this too, that *corruptio optimi est pessima*."[2] "If the Parliament should prove peevish" was an expression in his Diary to which exception was taken: but at most this was but to deny that all Parliaments must be impeccable—and some, as he said, had been called "unlearned" or "mad." As Parliament had been under Elizabeth, so he conceived it should be now. Mr. Peter Wentworth was a happy instance of how Parliamentary inquisitiveness should be treated. "King Charles had as good right, and with as little breach of Parliament privilege, to demand the six men which by his Attorney he had accused of treason, as that great Queen had to lay hold on Mr. Wentworth."[3]

That Laud was not more definite in laying down limits to the powers of Parliament was certainly due to no lack in him of the courage of his opinions. Where he was clear as to constitutional right, he did not hesitate to speak boldly. "They say," he answered at his trial, when he well knew that the Scots were thirsting for his

[1] See Prynne's *Breviate*, p. 7; cf. *Canterburie's Doome*, pp. 69 and 475. The whole question is exhaustively argued by the Rev. Chr. Wordsworth in his introduction to the *Coronation Book of Charles I.* (Henry Bradshaw Society).

[2] *Works*, iii. 433.

[3] *Ibid.*, vi. 231.

blood, and that his enemies in Parliament were their pledged allies, "that I did openly and often speak of them as of rebels and traitors. That indeed is true; I did so: and I spake as I then thought and as I think still": and of the Covenant, "if I did say it was 'ungodly, damnable, and treasonable,' I said no more than it deserved."[1] Rebellion he again and again asserted was wholly unlawful. To take arms against the sovereign was condemned by God and by history: and the differences of the Scots had better been settled by ink than by blood.

Laud, then, occupies in politics a position not unlike that he holds in theology. He abhorred too rigid definition. He would not state what might be, hypothetically, the powers of King or of Parliament. He would draw no line between them. He would impose no "particular" articles of political belief. But what had been decreed, what had been customary, what had behind it the forces of precedent and of law, biblical warrant, or the judges' decision—to that he adhered, and outside that he would not, if he might, allow others to stray.

But Laud's practical conduct of affairs of State is of more interest than his theory, and most interesting of all is his conduct in the Star Chamber. Here more than elsewhere, perhaps, he has suffered from the ignorant violence of partisan historians. The Star Chamber, it should not be necessary to repeat, was a lay court, and Laud was but one, and scarcely the most prominent, of its many members. The offences of which it took cognizance were offences against the State, not the Church, and the law upon which its decisions were

[1] *Works*, iii. 361, 362.

based was not the Canonical but the Common Law. Libel, perjury, fraud, riot, were more prominent among the charges brought before it than political offences. It was a legal court, contrary though it was to the true principles of the English Constitution; and Laud took it, as he found it, as part of the settled system under which it was his lot to live, and sat among its members as one of the ordinary duties which it fell to him to perform. Nothing was further from his mind than to play the tyrant or the bigot. He sat in the Star Chamber with as clear a conscience and as single an aim as those with which many clerks have sat in modern times on the bench of the Petty Sessions.

There are three great Star Chamber cases which are especially associated with the name of Laud, those of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick. These it may be well to examine as examples of the part which the Archbishop took in the proceedings of the court.

Prynne was a learned lawyer with a taste for lampoons. In 1632 his *Histriomastix* had, with coarse violence, reviled the acting and the dancing in which it was known that the Queen had shared, and had used the foulest words of all women who played a mimic part. He had declared that the murder of Nero was a justifiable execution because he frequented stage-plays; and in theatres Charles was known to take delight. Plays, Prynne declared, were altogether abominable, and those that beheld them were like devils incarnate. "That which hath birth from the devil is sin; and stage-plays have their birth from the devil, therefore stage-plays are sinful." It is doubtful if in any age the book would have been allowed to pass without prosecution. As it was, for his accusations against the Queen and his far

from obscure threat against the King, the Star Chamber fined him £5000, ordered him to be imprisoned during the King's pleasure, and degraded from his profession and his membership of Lincoln's Inn and Oxford, and finally to be set in the pillory and lose both his ears. The notes of Laud's speech show clearly the aspect in which the case appeared to him. He could have condemned but lightly the vulgar railing against the stage—"a thing indifferent"—but the references to the King and Queen were indubitable. "For Mr. Prynne," he said, "I am heartily sorry for him; for indeed I hold him guilty of high treason by the Act of Edward III." For high treason the punishment awarded, severe though it was in itself, was moderate. Laud took no further part in the affair than by seeing that the University of Oxford performed its part of the censure.

The cruel sentence was not fully carried out: Prynne's ears were but touched, not shorn; and when he a few days later wrote a "very libellous letter" to Laud, for which Noy in the Star Chamber demanded that he should be forbade pen and ink and shut up from church, Laud, with the instincts of a Christian and a scholar, would not hear of it; and insisted further that his books should be returned to him. "I forgave him," he wrote in his Diary. Prynne was not a man to make a martyr of; he "never handled any argument," says Mr. Gardiner, "without making it repulsive to those whom he sought to profit." If Milton could write masques and the Queen could act in them, it was not likely that men would believe in their wholesale immorality.

But Prynne was not silenced. Three years later

he appeared again before the Star Chamber with a minister, Henry Burton, and a physician, John Bastwick. The edge of Burton's bitter wit was sharpened by his personal rancour. He had been Charles's Clerk of the Closet when he was Prince of Wales, and had never forgiven those whom he believed to have urged the King not to retain him when he came to the throne. He had now published two sermons, in which he savagely attacked the position of the altars, the bowing towards them, and the placing upon them of the Cross. Bastwick was famous for his ribald "Litany," in which he charged the bishops with being the fathers of "ungodliness and unrighteousness, impiety and all manner of licentiousness," and declared that the wickedness of even one of their courts was enough to "bring down a continual and perpetual plague upon the King's three dominions." The Litany fervently besought "From plague, pestilence and famine, from bishops, priests and deacons, Good Lord, deliver us." Prynne was a more categorical accuser. In his "News from Ipswich" he launched out into vehement denunciation of every change, petty or great, that his ingenuity could discover. That the public fast had been enjoined on a Wednesday, that Elizabeth of Bohemia was no longer prayed for by name, were proofs of popery which stood side by side with the altars, the "duckings and cringings," and the public teaching of the school of Laud.

The three agreed in explicit condemnation of every change in the direction of reverence that had been introduced into the churches and the worship of England, and they coupled their condemnation of the acts with no obscure attacks upon the persons concerned. The case appeared to be so prominent that

Laud thought it well to answer the charges in detail in the Star Chamber. He entered into a clear and well-considered defence of the orders that had been issued in matters of ceremonial. He defended the bowings towards the altar, quoting the order of Henry V., "a prince then grown as religious as he was before victorious," to the Knights of the Garter, not as the full explanation of the practice, but as a justification of its innocence. He defended the position of the altar, and condemned, not without a spice of irony as sharp as his censure, the book which Williams was more than suspected to have written, *The Holy Table, Name and Thing*.[1] It was a timely *Apologia pro religione sua*.

The accused charged King and bishops with an intention to "change the orthodox religion and introduce popery." There was practically no defence. It was war to the knife, as Bastwick declared, between the Church and the libellers. Laud would not vote, but the court condemned them to lose their ears, to be imprisoned for life at Guernsey, Scilly, Jersey, and to be fined £5000 each. Laud never hesitated in his condemnation, and he never doubted that the sentence was according to law and custom. "Most certain it is," he was bold enough to say at his own trial,[2] "that howsoever the times went then or go now, yet in Queen Elizabeth's time Penry was hanged and Udal condemned and died in prison for less than is contained in Mr. Burton's book, as will be evident to any man

[1] There is in the Bodleian Library a copy of Laud's speech, with MS. notes, which Dr. Rawlinson certified (from a memoir of Arthur Earl of Anglesey, by Pett, p. 335) to have been written by Williams. They are extremely bitter. "Ignorant malice and orthodoxal wormwood" is his note on one passage (p. 26).

[2] *Works*, iii. 391.

that compares their writings together. And these saints would have lost their lives had they done that against any other State Christian which they did against this."

It was, to the mind of Laud, the State punishing the expression of opinions which were subversive of the social order; but his personal feeling towards libellers and Puritans had no bitterness. "I pitied them," he said, "as God knows, from my very heart."[1]

Other cases, though less famous, should not be passed by without comment. Alexander Leighton, a Scots minister, had, in his *Sion's Plea against Prelacy*, traced every evil of the time—moral, political, religious—to the bishops, "men of blood" and "trumpery of Antichrist." It was a piece of railing so vulgar and violent that we should nowadays be ready to receive it as evidence of a lack of sanity in the author. Leighton, however, was too staunch in his opinions and too bold in repeating his charges to be regarded by the Star Chamber as anything but a pestilent libeller. Laud, it is stated, spoke for two hours at the trial, but we have no firsthand evidence of what he said.[2] Leighton was condemned to a fine of £10,000 and the severest corporal penalties, but the King, it appears, was inclined to have pardoned him. He fled, was recaptured, and suffered part of his sentence, was scourged, and lost an ear. His speech on the scaffold repeated the common illusion of a religious maniac. "He told the people he suffered for their sins, and out of the Psalms and Isaiah applied unto himself the prophecies of Christ's sufferings." There is no reason to attribute to Laud any rancour

[1] *Works*, iii. 389.
[2] See Gardiner, *Hist. Eng.*, vol. vii. p. 150.

against Leighton. The accounts we have of the trial, especially Leighton's *Epitome,* are inconclusive where they are not scanty.

The State Papers contain many other references to Laud's action in the court. We have some of his own notes of cases, and letters of judges to him.[1] But we are not justified in forming any other conclusion on the evidence before us than that Laud acted with as little personal feeling and as much reverence for law and order as he did in every other sphere of his work The methods of the court were not of his making, nor its punishments of his choosing. It must also be remembered, when the horrible severity of the Star Chamber sentences is condemned, that only in exceptional cases were the fines exacted,[2] and that the personal punishments were on many occasions greatly mitigated.

When we judge Laud in his capacity as a member of the Star Chamber, we cannot but recognize the weakness of each particular charge of cruelty, or of personal influence. He sat with other judges, and he at least could say of the unhappy prisoners, "I pitied them from my very heart."

[1] E. g. *Cal. State Papers*, May 6, 1629; May 17, 1629.
[2] See Gardiner, vol. vii. p. 148, and note.

CHAPTER V.

THEOLOGY, AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS ROME.

Laud's reputation, good or ill, as an ecclesiastical statesman has almost entirely obscured his fame as a theologian. His sermons are almost unknown even to students of the seventeenth-century pulpit, and his Controversy with Fisher is rarely, if ever, referred to by modern controversialists who contend over the same field and not infrequently, though perhaps unconsciously, use the same weapons.

Two hundred years ago men thought differently. The sermons were reprinted even in the dark days of the suppression of the Church,[1] and the Conference, republished four times in the seventeenth century, became the authoritative statement of the position of Anglicanism in opposition to the Roman claims. Charles I. made an analysis of it with his own hands, and, as his last gift to his daughter Elizabeth, put it side by side with Andrewes's *Sermons* and Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*.

For the oblivion into which Laud's pulpit discourses

[1] An edition was published in 1651.

have fallen many reasons might be assigned. They are probably not even typical of his style. He was a constant, and, from the demand, apparently an admired preacher. He preached as willingly and as often in little country churches as in London or at Court. But he seems to have intentionally avoided all ostentation and as far as possible all record of his pulpit ministry. Not until comparatively late in his career did he notice in his Diary even his most important discourses; and he never suffered any of his sermons to be printed except by direct royal command. In his will he left the publication entirely in the hands of his executors. Thus, during his lifetime, only six of his sermons were published: all of them were preached on public occasions, and issued by order of James I. or Charles I. One other sermon, preached on March 27, 1631, on the anniversary of the royal accession, was printed without his correction or revision, after his death. We have thus to form our judgment of Laud as a preacher on seven only of his sermons, and those all of an "official" or "occasional" nature. There are few preachers who would wish to be judged by this test.

The first point that strikes a reader of the sermons is that they were modelled on those of Bishop Andrewes. Chamberlain, writing to Carleton of the first of these discourses, says, "Herewithal I send you a sermon of Dr. Laud's, because it is after the manner of the Bishop of Winchester's preaching." There can be no doubt that Laud admired and reverenced Andrewes more than any other Churchman of his day. He refers to him constantly in his writings, and in his defence during his trial, and as to an authority beyond appeal. Again and again he declares that he followed him

and him only. "All that I used was according to the copy of the late Reverend Bishop of Winchester." "Nor did I follow the *Pontifical*, but a copy of learned and reverend Bishop Andrewes," and the like. In his Diary he thus recorded his death: "Episcopus Winton. meritissimus, lumen orbis Christiani, mortuus est."

Andrewes was admittedly the greatest preacher of the day, and it is in keeping with the assimilative and receptive tone of Laud's mind that he should have thus consciously modelled himself on the preacher whose theology he so completely accepted. No imitation has the freshness of the original, but it must be admitted, I think, that Laud was more successful than Bishop Felton, who "had almost marred" his "own natural trot by endeavouring to imitate his artificial amble." His aim, then, was completeness rather than connection. His sermon was directly upon the text selected. He would not pass to application till he had thoroughly dissected and probed to the uttermost the passage he had selected to dwell upon. He sought too, if he did not always achieve, a clearness of direct statement: he had noted this as a merit when he first issued the sermons of his exemplar to the world. His illustrations are drawn from the Fathers and schoolmen, not often from the reformers, except Calvin, whom it may be conjectured he had read originally to confute him. His mental attitude is conservative, and yet touched with a certain sharp and unconventional freedom. Like all the preachers of the day, he does not disdain the assistance of humour and irony and of illustration of a very homely sort. Where he did not succeed in at all approaching his model was in pathos or

imagination: yet here we may remind ourselves of the very limited field which is covered by the discourses we possess. We do not know how he preached of the Incarnation, the Divine Ministry, the Passion.

The original characteristics of his sermons appear to be two. They illustrate both the tendency of his mind and his view of the questions of the time. He refers again and again to the lessons, or the psalms, of the day. It was the providential ordering of God through the fixed worship and ceremonial of the Church which appealed to him from the first, and increasingly, with a solemn and overmastering force. God taught through rules which past ages had laid down, not independently of them. So the daily lessons and psalms spoke to him with a distinct message, a special teaching, for the day. It was so when he was charged with treason and stayed waiting till the evening before he was taken to the Tower. "I went to evening prayer in my chapel. The psalms of the day (ninety-three and ninety-four) gave me great comfort. God make me worthy of it and fit to receive it." So in his sermon before the Parliament of 1628, he draws teaching from the first lesson at Evening Prayer, and then ends with S. Paul's prayer and benediction. "It is the prayer of this day, for it is the second lesson at evening service."

The other characteristic is his appeal to history, seen in his fondness for historical allusion or illustration. Preaching on March 17, on Unity, he is reminded that on "this day Julius Cæsar overthrew Sextus Pompeius . . . . and this very day too Frederick II. entered Jerusalem, and recovered whatsoever Saladin had taken from the Christians. But I must tell you these emperors and their forces were great keepers of unity."

Like all the writers of the time, he has an insatiate fondness for quotation: in this same sermon he quotes Lucan, Cæsar, Cassiodorus, Tacitus, Seneca, S. Leo, S. Augustine, S. Basil, S. Gregory, S. Chrysostom, S. Bernard, S. Thomas Aquinas, Calvin, Bucer, and many more; but in the case of the Greek Fathers he generally used Latin versions, and his quotations are seldom exact, indeed they are many of them rather of the nature of references. The sermon on Unity is typical of his method. It was designed for a practical object—to bring the Commons at the opening of the Parliament of 1628 to see the weakness that was caused to the State by divisions. It was a familiar thought with him. Jerusalem, he said in his first sermon before King James, "stands not here for the city and the State only, as many of the ancient name the city only, nor for the Temple and the Church only; but jointly for both. For both: therefore when you sit down to consult, you must not forget the Church; and when we kneel down to pray, we must not forget the State: both are but one Jerusalem."[1] His third sermon chose the same subject —"Jerusalem is built as a city that is at unity in itself." Unhappily it was easier to urge than to influence.

Few then as are the sermons of Laud which we possess, they serve in a measure to explain the nature of his power over Churchmen. They express his mind —decided, clear, forgetful of self, fixed on great ends, and believing that the policy which he set forth was based on right, on precedent, and on the direction of God in history.

These principles go some way to explain his attitude on the Roman question. He believed firmly in the

[1] *Works*, i. 5, 6.

bases of the English Church in Holy Scripture, history, and reason. He had no doubt whatever as to his position, and he stood to it firmly.

Laud's Controversy with Fisher was one of a number of similar combats. Only in its interest and the force of its dialectic it rose above the rest. They may have been "the legitimate successors of the disputations of the schools"; they were certainly a prominent feature of the Reformation movement, and not least of the work of the Jesuits in the Catholic reaction: and they were especially favoured by the King, who was a trained theologian, and who delighted in discussion.

The circumstances of this conference, however, gave it peculiar interest. The Countess of Buckingham, the mother of the King's friend, was "wavering in point of religion," [1] or perhaps had already been won over to the Roman Church [2]; she had been under instruction from Father John Percy, a prominent member of the mission, more commonly known as 'Fisher the Jesuit.'

It was this Percy or Piercy who had brought Chillingworth for a time into the Roman Church, and had recently converted Buckingham's brother, Lord Purbeck: [3] and it is clear that Buckingham himself was doubting. Conferences between Fisher and Anglican divines, at one of which the King had himself been present, had already taken place, but they had satisfied no one. The Countess of Buckingham required more clear statement on the doctrine of "a continual, infallible, visible Church." Thereupon James himself commanded Laud,

[1] Laud's Diary, April 23, 1622.

[2] See *Life of Archbishop Laud*, by 'A Romish Recusant,' pp. 76-7.

[3] Stonyhurst MS., *Anglia*, vol vii., quoted in *Life of Laud*, by 'A Romish Recusant,' p. 76.

then Bishop of S. David's, to meet Fisher in discussion. On May 24, 1622, the interview took place. Whatever its immediate result,—and it at least confirmed the shallow Buckingham in the Anglican Church,—it became, from the literature which flowed from it, and from the prominence which Laud's own publication of its points secured, the classic presentation from the English side of the theological differences between England and Rome. The conference got into print, and the first report produced a series of books. Laud was content to stand to the judgment of posterity on his theology, as expressed in the conference. "With what strength I have written," he said at his trial, "I leave to posterity to judge when the envy which now overloads me shall be buried with me. This I will say with S. Gregory Nazianzen, 'I never laboured for peace to the wrong and detriment of Christian verity,' nor I hope ever shall." And he added in his MS., "Let the Church of England, for in great humility I crave to write this—that the Church of England must leave the way it is now going,[1] and come back to that way of defence which I have followed in my book, or she shall never be able to justify her separation from the Church of Rome." In his will he expressly desired that the conference might be translated into Latin and sent abroad, "that the Christian world may see and judge of my religion."

Laud's opinion of his own book was widely shared by his contemporaries. But it was severely attacked by Romanists, and especially in the "Labyrinthus Cantuariensis; or Dr. Laud's Labyrinth," by T. C., in 1658

[1] *I. e.* the violent "No Popery" cry expressed in his own trial.

or 1663.[1] It was defended by Meric Casaubon and by Stillingfleet.[2] The result of forty years' contention was to leave it the strongest expression of the Anglican position. In modern times it has secured the condemnation of some writers[3] as dull, and the approbation of others[4] as vigorous. Of its merits few readers can have any real doubt. Sir Edward Dering, foe though he was, said truly, "His book against the Jesuit will be his lasting epitaph."

Laud's first full account of the controversy was published in 1639. Later editions, based upon the Archbishop's corrections,[5] were issued in 1673 and 1686, and 1839 and 1849. The preface to the original edition contains much matter of personal interest. Laud's humour breaks out in his offer of the book to his Jesuit opponent as "such a bone to gnaw as may shake his teeth if he look not to it." He explains the delay in the publication by the State employments which had made him "too much a stranger to his books," as well as the fever which laid him low in the autumn of 1629, and the libels which clustered round him in the subsequent years. From that he turns to a statement of the Church's danger. "She professes the ancient Catholic faith, and yet the Romanist condemns her of novelty in her doctrine; she practises

[1] The title-page says "Paris, 1658," but Stillingfleet asserts that it was not published till 1663 (preface).

[2] 'A Romish Recusant,' who lays some stress on T. C.'s "reputation," does not seem to have met with Stillingfleet's reply.

[3] Such as Mr. Benson, *Life of Laud*, pp. 95, 200. "A nearly unreadable folio" is, I think, a somewhat hasty expression.

[4] Such as Sir James Stephen, *Horae Sabbaticae*, in a very interesting and valuable criticism.

[5] A copy of the conference in the Royal Library at Windsor contains MS. corrections in Laud's hand.

Church government as it hath been in use in all ages and all places where the Church of Christ hath taken any rooting, both in and ever since the Apostles' times, and yet the Separatist condemns her for anti-Christianism in her discipline. The plain truth is, she is between these two factions, as between two millstones, and unless your Majesty look to it, to whose trust she is committed, she will be ground to powder, to an irreparable both dishonour and loss to this kingdom."

In the controversy itself Laud was under two disadvantages. He had little if any knowledge of the previous discussions, and no information of the ground which he was himself to contest, nor so much as twenty-four hours to prepare himself. And, secondly, he was hampered—it is the greatest disadvantage of English controversialists since the Reformation—by the unauthorized publications of Protestant divines, claiming to speak for the English Church. The clearness and accuracy of his mind nevertheless served him in good stead, and he was able to steer clear of the dangers that beset him.

The leading lines of his work bear considerable resemblance to those taken by the divines of to-day. The position of the Greek Church,[1] "a true Church in the main substance, to and at this day, though erroneous perhaps in some points," was a strong argument against the exclusive claims of Rome. "I dare not deny them to be a true Church," he said, and on the *Filioque* controversy he spoke with true theological judgment.

The infallibility of the Church also was a point of strongest contention: and Laud would not allow in-

[1] *Works*, ii. 25.

fallibility to any particular or local church. The particular Church of Rome has erred, and cannot be infallible. To this point he returns again and again. Rome is "a true Church, I grant,"[1] but not *the* true Church. The whole Church cannot err,[2] but parts can err and have erred. Salvation, surely, is open to Romanists, but "not as they are Romanists but as they are Christians; that is, as they believe the Creed and hold the foundation Christ Himself, not as they associate themselves wittingly and knowingly to the gross superstitions of the Romish Church."[3] Yet to say this is not to deny the privilege of the Church. "For we confess as well as you, that out of the Catholic Church of Christ there is no salvation. But what do you mean by 'out of the Church'? Sure, out of the Roman Church. Why, the Roman Church and the Church of England are but two distinct members of that Catholic Church which is spread over the face of the earth. Therefore, Rome is not the house where the Church dwells; but Rome itself, as well as other particular Churches, dwells in this great universal house."[4]

It is Christ Who is the foundation of the Universal Church: and Peter's Rock "is not S. Peter's person, either only or properly, but the faith which he professed. And to this, besides the evidence which is in text and truth, the Fathers come in with very full consent."[5]

The work of the Reformation and the deeds of the reformers were, then as now, confused by controversialists for purposes of attack on the English

[1] *Works*, ii. 143. [2] *Ibid.*, ii. 155-8. [3] *Ibid.*, ii. 333.
[4] *Ibid.*, ii. 346. [5] *Ibid.*, ii. 257.

Church. Laud's answer is dignified and complete. "Reformation, especially in cases of religion, is so difficult a work, and subject to so many pretensions, that it is almost impossible but the reformers should step too far, or fall too short, in some smaller things or other; which, in regard of the far greater benefit coming by the Reformation itself, may well be passed over and borne withal. But if there have been any wilful and gross errors, not so much in opinion as in fact, sacrilege too often pretending to reform superstition, that is the crime of the reformers, not of the Reformation; and they are long since gone to God to answer it, to Whom I leave them."[1]

Careful though he is to reject the errors of the reformers, Laud does not reject the name of Protestant. He rather explains its meaning and its historical and Catholic usage. "The Protestants did not get that name by protesting against the Church of Rome, but by protesting, and that when nothing else would serve, against her errors and superstitions. Do you but remove them from the Church of Rome, and our Protestation is ended, and the separation too. Nor is Protestation itself such an unheard-of thing in the very heart of religion. For the sacraments both of the Old and New Testaments are called by your own school 'visible signs protesting the faith.' Now if the sacraments be *protestantia*, 'signs protesting,' why may not men also, and without all offence, be called Protestants, since by receiving the true sacraments and by refusing them which are corrupted, they do but protest the sincerity of their faith against the doctrinal corruption which hath invaded the great Sacrament

[1] *Works*, ii. 173-4.

of the Eucharist, and other parts of religion? Especially, since they are men which must protest their faith by these visible signs and sacraments."[1]

Yet Protestant though he be, Laud by no means departs from Catholic doctrine. "For the Church of England nothing is more plain than that it believes and teaches the true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist[2]; unless A. C. can make a Body no Body, and Blood no Blood—as perhaps he can by transubstantiation, as well as bread no bread, and wine no wine. And the Church of England is Protestant too."[3] He brings Ridley as a witness. "Both you and I," he said to his Roman opponent, "agree herein: that in the Sacrament is the very true and natural Body and Blood of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into heaven, which sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead; only we differ *in modo*, 'in the way and manner of being': we confess all one thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there. I (being fully by God's word thereunto persuaded) confess Christ's natural Body to be in the Sacrament [indeed] by spirit and grace, &c. You make a grosser kind of being, enclosing a natural [a lively and a moving] Body under the shape and form of bread and wine."[4] Nor is he less precise or

Works, ii. 152.

[2] He adds a note quoting the English Liturgy.

[3] The rest of the passage is not relevant to my point here. It may be argued that as he declares Calvin to have believed in a Real Presence, he admits English agreement with him. But he nowhere says this; and if he had meant it he would have said it.

[4] *Works*, ii. 330. From these and many other passages it is clear that Mr. Simpkinson, *Life of Laud*, p. 129, is in error when he implies that Laud did not teach the Presence of Christ in the consecrated elements.

less judicious on the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. "At and in the Eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices: one by the priest only, that is the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death; . . . another by the priest and people jointly, and that is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; . . . the third, by every particular man for himself only, and that is the sacrifice of every man's body and soul to serve Him in both all the rest of his life."[1] In the same style he speaks of the authority of scripture and of general councils, condemns private judgment and the Romish doctrine of purgatory, and ends by a repeated denial of the Pope's infallibility.[2]

So far we find Laud a stalwart assertor of the position of the English Church as firm in adherence to the Catholic doctrine. Of equal interest, and calculated to win an even wider respect and agreement, is his decisive claim for breadth and tolerance. The Church of England, in his assertion, is strong and Catholic because she utters no anathemas where Christ has not uttered them. "She comes far short of the Church of Rome's severity, whose anathemas are not only for thirty-nine articles, but for very many more, above one hundred in matter of doctrine, and that in many points as far remote from the foundation; though, to the far greater rack of men's consciences, they must all be made fundamental, if the Church have once determined them: whereas the Church of England never declared that every one of her articles are fundamental in the

[1] *Works*, ii. 340-41.

[2] It should be observed, that the author of *Laud's Labyrinth* asserts that "Catholic faith (in this particular) only obliges us to maintain that the Pope is infallible when he defines with a general council" (p. 143).

faith. For it is one thing to say, No one of them is superstitious or erroneous; and quite another to say, Every one of them is fundamental, and that in every part of it, to all men's belief. Besides, the Church of England prescribes only for her own children, and by those articles provides but for her own peaceable consent in those doctrines of truth. But the Church of Rome severely imposes her doctrine upon the whole world, under the pain of damnation." [1]

For himself, as for the National Church, he says that it is impossible to set bounds to the Divine compassion. "Nor will I ever take upon me to express that tenet or opinion, the denial of the foundation only excepted, which may shut any Christian, even the meanest, out of heaven."

These were bold words, or so they seem to us who draw our knowledge of seventeenth-century theology from the bitter controversialists of Rome and Geneva. The "ever-memorable John Hales," says Clarendon, "would often say that he would renounce the religion of the Church of England to-morrow if it obliged him to believe that any other Christian should be damned." Chillingworth and Falkland were with him; and William Laud, disciplinarian and Catholic though he was, was of the company.

From a study of the conference with Fisher we should expect to find Laud firm in his own position against Rome, but not in favour of persecution of Romanists. Such was his policy in Ireland, where he was eager to substitute conciliation for the policy of mulct and coercion. In England the question was, to him, even more pressing. There the Church's chief foes were

[1] *Works*, i. p. 60.

often almost of her own household. James's constant negotiations with the Papacy, the ostentatious proselytism affected by Henrietta Maria, the defection of some notable personages such as Lady Falkland, the Countess of Buckingham, and Sir Tobie Matthew, and the presence about the Court of secret as well as open Papal agents, served to alarm strong defenders of English Catholicity as well as Puritan haters of Rome and all its works.

As a statesman, and a minister to individual souls, Laud had a hard task. In both aspects his work demands attention. As a statesman he was confronted by the gravest political dangers. Popular feeling had never forgotten the Gunpowder Plot, and the House of Commons under Pym's guidance was always on the track of real or imaginary Popish intrigues, and was sternly set on severe repression of Romanists. It was not surprising that Laud should himself be accused of "Popery." And to the suspicious eyes that were on the watch there seemed to be evidence to warrant the charge, not only in his Catholic principles, but in actual negotiations with Rome. The letters of Panzani, Con, and Rossetti,[1] papal agents at the English Court and in Ireland, show how far the intrigues went. Windebanke, who had been raised to office through Laud's instrumentality, in September 1635 professed to enter into definite discussion with Panzani, and in the next month declared that he had the King's orders to confer concerning a possible reunion. The negotiations were con-

[1] In Roman transcripts in Record Office. See also *Historical MSS. Commission, Appendix to IX. Report*, p. 360 *sqq.* Panzani's *Memoirs* (by Rev. J. Berington) do not contain anything of importance relating to Laud. On Panzani's notorious ignorance of English opinion, see a Roman Catholic writer, Rev. C. Plowden, *Remarks on Panzani's Memoirs*, 1794.

tinued by Bishop Mountague. Panzani's account shows clearly enough how greatly he both misunderstood and exaggerated the opinions of the leaders of the English Church.[1] It is difficult to believe that any one who knew Laud as Mountague did would describe him as "pauroso e circonspetto"; but even on Panzani's showing it was admitted that Laud showed no eagerness for reunion, and had warned Charles that "if he wished to go to Rome, the Pope would not stir a step to meet him."[2] Some at least of the Roman authorities did not regard it as safe to meddle with him.[3] But it would appear that efforts were made to allure or to entrap Laud, at the moment when Abbot's death made his appointment to Canterbury probable, by the offer of a cardinal's hat. His Diary, which states the fact, shows how decided was his answer—"My answer was that somewhat dwelt within me which would not suffer that till Rome were other than it is." The offer was probably made by the Queen,[4] or one of her suite. Later, Con, a Scotsman who knew a little more of English affairs than the Italian Panzani, made (according to Heylin) the same offer; but Laud always refused to see him,[5] and not even the detective skill of Prynne could find any evidence of negotiations between

[1] I may be permitted to refer to my article on Richard Mountague in *Dictionary of National Biography*.

[2] Panzani's mission is exhaustively discussed by Mr. S. R. Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. vii., p. 130 *sqq*. "Neither the Archbishop nor the King," he well says, "was likely to listen seriously to such a scheme."

[3] An Oratorian father sent to England in 1635 was forbidden on "any pretext whatever to allow himself to be drawn into communication with the new Archbishop of Canterbury."—Barberini, quoted in *Life of Laud* by 'A Romish Recusant,' p. 224.

[4] See Dr. Lingard, *Hist. Eng.*, vol. ii., chap. v., footnote.

[5] *Works*, iv. 332; cf. *Rome's Masterpiece*.

them. At his trial Laud clearly rebutted the charge, "declaring that if he had desired preferment for compliance with the Church of Rome, he might have had more honour in foreign parts than ever he was likely to obtain here, and that it was no outward honour but his conscience that caused him to refuse the cardinal's hat." [1]

Count Rossetti, in 1641, appears to have made other efforts, and during his stay in Ireland to have had some communication with Archbishop Usher, certainly a very unlikely person to lean towards Rome.[2] A strange story is told of an offer to bribe Laud by a pension of a thousand crowns.[3] The only conclusion that can be arrived at after a careful consideration of all these extraordinary statements is that the Roman agents were more active than intelligent, and that their intrigues gave a natural foundation for Puritan suspicions, for which Laud's own conduct and opinions afforded no ground.

Had Laud been willing to seek a reconciliation with Rome, it is clear that he would not have been so eager as he was, during the whole of his career, to win English converts from Romanism. He had no doubt that the English Church was the guardian of the Catholic faith in the island, and he regarded any desertion of her by

[1] Clarke MS., Tuesday, March 12, 1643. This interesting touch is not to be found in Rushworth, Prynne, or Laud's own account.

[2] *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Irland*, von A. Bellesheim, vol. i. p. 688.

[3] See *Life of Laud*, by 'A Romish Recusant,' p. 395 *sqq.*, and the original passage, *Hist. MSS. Comm., App. to IX. Report*, p. 350, where it is said Laud was told that 1500 scudi per annum would be enough to support prelatical state in Rome! There the story is told in connection with M. S. Giles. Cf. Laud's *Works*, iv. 326 *sqq.*

Englishmen as an apostasy. More than this. Not only was the question of jurisdiction involved, but to his mind the difference between England and Rome was between liberty and bondage. This explains his constant efforts to reclaim English converts, and makes so conclusive his appeal at his trial to the success of his attempts. He gave a list of twenty-two persons whom by his own persuasions he had "recalled from Rome," and he added, "let any clergyman of England come forth and give a better account of his zeal to this present Church."[1] Among the names he gave are two of special interest. Sir William Webbe, his own kinsman,[2] was in 1633 brought back by his influence, and with the ministration of Dr. Cosin, then Rector of Brancepeth. An interesting letter now in the Record Office thanks Laud for his religious care, and promises to be guided by him, especially in such things as belong to his soul. He had 'on Tuesday last received the Blessed Sacrament, most reverently here administered, intending to continue in the religion and communion of the Church of England so long as he shall live.'[3]

Chillingworth, the famous writer of the *Religion of Protestants,* was a man of much greater fame. He was Laud's godson, had been Fellow of Trinity, and then, being converted to Romanism by the adroit Fisher, had gone to study at Douay. He did not find satisfaction in the Roman Communion, and eventually

[1] *Works,* iii. 63—66, iv. 413, 414, note. "At his going forth Mr. Peter (*sic*) told him there were those ministers that could prove not only 22 but 200, yea, some above 500, that were converted by their diligent and faithful labours in the work of the ministry, and might have recalled more had they not been silenced by him" (Clarke MS.). Cf. *Works,* as above.

[2] Grandson of his uncle Sir W. Webbe, Lord Mayor of London.

[3] *Cal. State Papers,* 1633-4, p. 154.

returned to Oxford. Laud had not lost sight of him. In March 1628 several letters passed between him and Juxon, and the latter procured interviews between Sheldon (then Fellow of All Souls', and described by Juxon as "an ingenuous and discreet man") and Chillingworth. Eventually Juxon brought Chillingworth directly under Laud's influence, though he doubted if "all his motives be spiritual, protest he never so much."[1] The position which Laud had taken up in his controversy with Fisher was one which appealed with great force to the acute and critical mind of Chillingworth. Perplexed and doubting when confronted by the mass of authorized teaching and compulsory belief which confronted him at Douay, he found satisfaction in a theory such as Laud had expressed when he said, "the Church of England never declared that every one of her articles are fundamental in the faith; for it is one thing to say, 'No one of them is superstitious or erroneous,' and quite another to say, 'Every one of them is fundamental, and that in every part of it, to all men's belief.'"[2]

Chillingworth returned to the English Church, and before long set himself to write a defence of his position against the Roman controversialist Knott. "Nothing is necessary to be believed but what is plainly revealed," was his thesis, and it is not difficult to see that he was indebted for it to the teaching of Laud. The *Religion of Protestants* appeared in 1637, the *Controversy with Fisher* in 1639. They were both signs of the same movement. Chillingworth was more of the logician and critic, Laud leaned more towards theology and

[1] For the correspondence, see *Cal. State Papers.*
[2] *Works*, ii. 60.

history, but their contention was in the main the same. It was a protest against the all-embracing dogmatism of the Papacy.[1]

Sir Kenelm Digby, the eccentric Cavalier who fills so much space in the Memoirs of the time, does not appear to have been one of Laud's own converts, but he none the less felt that the Archbishop had a peculiar and personal interest in his faith. The son of the Sir Everard Digby who had taken part in the Gunpowder Plot, he was brought up as a Romanist, but had come over to the English Church, and afterwards became intimate with Laud, through whom he presented many valuable MSS. to the University of Oxford. Laud had no concern in his conversion, but speaks of it as occurring when he was of full discretion to examine the contested questions for himself.[2] In 1636 Digby returned to the Roman Communion, but with no loss of his affection for the Archbishop. At the very point of his conversion, he wrote, "I acknowledge myself excessively bound to my Lord's Grace of Canterbury for his wonderful goodness and affection shown to me": and Laud's letter to him in answer to his announcement is one of the most natural and pathetic that he ever penned.[3]

For a man who felt so deeply as did Laud on the

[1] For Laud's connection with the book, see *Works*, vi. *passim*. Cf. Sir James Stephen, *Horae Sabbaticae*. With the greatest respect, I am unable to agree with Mr. Gardiner's statement that Cheynell, who tormented Chillingworth as he lay dying, descried, dimly in the distant future, "behind" his "deathbed, the shadowy forms of Voltaire and the Commune of Paris."

[2] Laud's *Works*, vii. 450, 452; cf. *Life*, by 'A Romish Recusant,' pp. 272, 273.

[3] The 'Romish Recusant,' kindly though his tone is, perhaps hardly does it full justice.

"Roman question," it was no slight exercise of generosity to write with no touch of bitterness; and while deploring the silence that Digby had observed towards him during the period of his doubts, to end, "a poor but respective friend I have been ever since I knew you; and it is not your change that can change me, who never yet left but where I was first forsaken, and not always there." And Digby at least appreciated the friendship, for amid the danger that beset every one who would say a word for Laud during his trial, he bore witness strongly in his favour, and ever spoke of him with respect and affection.

It was not only in his writings or in his dealings with individuals that Laud showed himself a decided foe of the Roman claims. The very principles of his theology, his appeal to reason, to criticism, and to history, made those Romanists who knew England best rejoice at his fall. "They had cause to rejoice," said one of them, when the news of his death reached Rome, "that the greatest enemy of the Church of Rome in England was cut off, and the greatest champion of the Church of England silenced."[1]

Yet foe though Laud was to the Roman claims, he observed a distinction which was far from common in his time. He was always opposed to the enforcement of persecuting laws against the English Romanists. He was willing to recognize the ministrations of their clergy, within certain limits, in England. He spoke with respect of the Roman bishop of Chalcedon, and does not seem to have been actively adverse to a spiritual jurisdiction over Romanists in England being

[1] See *Works*, iv. 504.

exercised by a Vicar-Apostolic.[1] And he again and again decisively pronounced against any punishment for mere opinion, and adhered to the principle upon which the English government had always claimed to act. "When divers Romish priests and Jesuits have deservedly suffered death for treason," he declared at the trial of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, "is it not the constant and just profession of the State, that they never put any man to death for religion, but for rebellion and treason only? Doth not the State truly affirm, that there was never any law made against the life of a Papist, *quatenus* a Papist only? And is not all this stark false, if their very religion be rebellion? For if their religion be rebellion, it is not only false, but impossible, that the same man, in the same act, should suffer for his rebellion and not for his religion. And this King James understood very well, when in his Premonition to all Christian Monarchs he saith, 'I do constantly maintain that no Papist, either in my time, or in the time of the late Queen, ever died for his conscience.'"[2]

To the end, amid the wildest terrors of alarmed Protestantism, and when, between the intrigues of the Court, the weakness of the King, and the fierce attacks of his adversaries, it was difficult indeed to keep a clear head and a brave heart, he steered an even course. Rome could not lure nor could Geneva affright him. His heart stood fast, for he believed in the Divine mission which God had given to the English Church.

[1] See Brady's *Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy in England and Scotland*, p. 102. But he utterly opposed the establishment of "any Popish hierarchy" (*Works*, iii. 419).

[2] *Works*, vi. 54, 55.

CHAPTER VI.

FOREIGN REFORMED BODIES: IRELAND AND SCOTLAND.

LAUD'S relations to foreign reformed bodies might appear to be likely to throw light on his position with regard to the Roman claims. As a matter of fact, there is little in them of any interest. One of his earliest essays in Divinity had been to "unchurch" the foreign Protestants[1]; and there is nothing in his public action to show that he ever changed his opinion. He spoke at his trial in condemnation of the English custom of setting great store by foreign opinion in religious matters.[2] His own opinion was clean contrary. "The worst thought I had of any reformed Church in Christendom," he said,[3]—and the passage admirably expresses his whole attitude on the question,—"was to wish it like the Church of England; and so much better as it should please God to make it. And 'the deepest intention' I had concerning all or any of them was how they might not only be wished, but made so." Political exigencies, the national interest in the

[1] Cf. also Cont. Fisher, *Works*, ii. 194, note *u*; iv. 307.
[2] *Works*, iii. 352.
[3] *Ibid.*, iii. 374.

Thirty Years' War, and the sad plight of the King's sister Elizabeth and her children, made it impossible for him to avoid much correspondence on German politics. We find him constantly corresponding with Sir Thomas Roe (whose wife he had known as a child), Charles's envoy to the Swedish king, but the subject of the correspondence is mainly political. A project for an union between the Lutheran and Calvinist bodies, which was undertaken by a Scots clergyman named John Durie, received but "languid support"[1] from the Archbishop. The negotiations dragged on from 1632 to 1636. The greater part of the letters that passed have been preserved, and are now among the MSS. of Lord Braye and of the House of Lords. Laud was ready to advocate an union between the two divisions of German Protestants, and spoke of Mr. Durie's intentions as "very pious"; but he was careful in no way to commit the King, the Church, or himself to any further project.

The pressing requests of Sir Thomas Roe were entirely unavailing.[2] Laud instructed Sir Robert Anstruther that the King's name was on no account to be engaged without his express warrant.[3] He endeavoured as much as possible to keep out of foreign complications.

[1] The phrase is Mr. Gardiner's (*Hist. Eng.*, vol. vii. p. 314), and appears like to be fully justified by the correspondence (see *Cal. State Papers*, Laud's *Works*, and especially the MSS. of Lord Braye, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, *Report X.*, App., pt. 6, p. 130 *sqq.*). A different view is taken in the *Life of Archbishop Laud*, by 'A Romish Recusant,' p. 191 *sqq.*, in which it is contended that Laud was anxious for an union of all Protestant bodies, including the Church of England. The author does not appear to have seen the correspondence in Lord Braye's MSS., which seems to me absolutely conclusive evidence to the contrary.

[2] See *Cal. State Papers*, 1633-4, July 31, 1633, p. 161.

[3] Braye MSS., p. 131.

The letters of Elizabeth and her son Charles Louis received but tepid replies. "I do not doubt," Sir Thomas Roe was obliged to write to Elizabeth in 1635,[1] "my Lord of Canterbury hath good inclinations, and as much credit as ever any servant had, but he is not versed in foreign affairs, and he is fearful to engage himself and his master in new ways and of doubtful event." That he did not meddle with foreign politics where he could help it was due no doubt both to prudence and to the feeling which he entertained towards the religious dissensions of the Protestants. The King too held a middle course. He "no doubt felt an interest in his nephew's fortunes and desired to assist him, but when definite proposals were put before him he never could see anything in them but their difficulties."[2] The Elector Charles Louis and his brother Rupert paid a long visit to England, and remained till the end of July 1637, but achieved nothing.

The relations between Laud and the pastors of the Swiss Reformed bodies bear out the view that the English Church was not willing to enter into anything of the nature of ecclesiastical union with the foreign Protestants. The missions of Wake and Fleming were confined to the encouragement of a general alliance against the Hapsburgs. When the Swiss pastors endeavoured to appeal to religious agreement, and to espouse the cause of the Scots Presbyterians, they were met with polite but chilling replies.[3] At home his action towards the

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, 1635, July $\frac{3}{13}$, p. 244. There are a number of letters from the Queen of Bohemia to Laud, *e.g.* Feb. $\frac{5}{15}$, 1634; April $\frac{20}{30}$, 1635; $\frac{\text{July } 27}{\text{Aug. } 6}$, 1636.

[2] *Cal. State Papers*, 1637, Preface, p. xxv.

[3] See the letters printed by Professor Stern from Zurich archives in his interesting paper, *Die Reformirte Schweiz in ihren Bezie-*

foreign reformed bodies was more decided. He set himself resolutely to win them to the Church of England. Both as bishop and archbishop, in his own name and the King's, he urged and required that they should attend the worship of the national Church. In his memoranda for his metropolitical visitation[1] he put under the sees of Canterbury and Norwich a special inquiry as to what liturgy was used in the foreign refugee churches, and whether those who were born English subjects would not conform. His vicar-general, Sir Nathaniel Brent, found the French and Dutch ministers willing to do their best to meet the Primate's wishes, and some degree of conformity at least was attained.[2] It was Laud's belief that, having settled in England, the refugees should conform to the uses of the Catholic Church in the country. He urged that they should be present at the Eucharist, and hoped that in the next generation their children would be definitely brought up as English Churchmen.[3]

As Bishop of London he was charged with the superintendence of British congregations abroad. It was his care to see that they did not lapse into the customs of the foreign Protestants. In 1633 the British

---

hungen zu Karl I. von England, William Laud, Erzbischof von Canterbury, und den Covenanters.

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, 1634-5, p. 575.

[2] Mr. Gardiner speaks of this policy with severity, vol. viii. pp. 120-21.

[3] 'A Romish Recusant' (p. 214) says, "The late Dean Stanley was blamed by High Churchmen for admitting people who did not believe in the Divinity of our Lord to Communion; yet the great champion of their own school, Archbishop Laud, *would not only have admitted them*, but would have exempted them from penalties in return for their compliance." I can find no ground for this statement.

ambassador at the Hague wrote to the English Council that the merchant adventurers at Delft had fallen entirely into Presbyterianism.[1] Laud took the matter in hand. He was placed on the committee for considering the business of the merchant adventurers. In 1634 a new priest was sent to them, and the merchants were strictly enjoined that in all things they conform to "the doctrine and discipline settled in the Church of England."[2] In 1637[3] Laud is found to be paying special attention to the appointment of the deputies or resident agents at the staple towns, on whose action it was found that the regulation of Church matters in the towns greatly depended. He had previously succeeded in obtaining the use of the Prayer-Book by the English regiments in the Dutch service. His hopes went further. He had drawn up, with Juxon, a 'Form of Penance and Reconciliation of Apostates from the Christian Religion to Turcism.'[4] He and his brother prelates hoped to remove the horrible scandal of apostasy. They planned, says Heylin, that there should be "a Church of England in all courts of Christendom, in the chief cities of the Turk and other great Mahometan princes, and in all our factories and plantations in every known part of the world, by which it might be rendered as diffused and Catholic as the Church of Rome."

The idea shows the width and enthusiasm of Laud's outlook. But difficulties nearer home prevented the

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, March 18, 1633.
[2] *Ibid.*, June 21, 1634. [3] *Ibid.*, 1637. Preface, p. xxvii.
[4] 'A Romish Recusant,' *Life of Laud*, p. 310, somewhat strangely censures this office for its lack of any attractive character. But surely a severely penitential treatment is the only public recognition the Church could give of her horror of the sin of one who had put Christ to an open shame.

realization of any such magnificent schemes. The claims of Ireland and of Scotland came upon the Primate as more pressing and immediate.

Towards Ireland Laud was drawn both as an educationalist and as a friend of Wentworth. Perhaps his first Irish interest was that in Trinity College, Dublin. The history of his relations with that body may serve as an introduction to that of his connection with the Irish Church as a whole.

His letters to Strafford show him always an enthusiastic admirer of his own University. There is many a mock at the "Cambridge man"[1] and the customs of his *alma mater*, and Strafford replies with jests at Oxford and S. John's. When he was called upon to undertake the reform of Trinity College, Dublin, it was upon the Oxford model that he proceeded to work. Abbot had been Chancellor. On his death, Archbishop Usher, the Irish Primate, was eager that Laud should succeed him. He was the most powerful friend the College could win, and his intimate knowledge of University life, no less than his generous patronage of learning, seemed to mark him as peculiarly fitted for the post. The Fellows readily chose him, and he somewhat reluctantly accepted the honour. "I am sorry they have chosen me Chancellor," he wrote to Strafford, "and if they will follow the directions I have given them by my Lord Primate, I hope they will send me a

[1] *E. g.* "I pray what means this Johnnism of yours, 'till the rights of the Pastors be a little more settled'? You learnt this from old Alvye or Billy Nelson; for where, I pray, in all the ancient Fathers do you find Pastor applied to any but a Bishop? Well, I see the errors of your breeding will stick by you: Pastors and elders and all will come in if I let you alone."—L. to S., *Works*, vi. 373.

resignation that I may give it over and your lordship be chosen, being upon the place, and able to do them more good." He was elected September 14, 1633. The condition of the college was such as to suggest if not to demand revision of the statutes. His action as Chancellor was of a piece with the work, in which he so heartily joined with the Lord-Deputy, of reviving and strengthening the Irish Church. Trinity College had fallen into neglect. Its members were few and its scholars indifferent. The provision that Fellowships should be held only for seven years after the M.A. degree was believed to act disadvantageously, as preventing a permanent interest among the officials in the progress of the college. The Fellows also were a quarrelsome body, and Strafford had frequently to intervene to make peace. Laud took up the work of Chancellor in the same spirit in which he took up the rest of his multifarious activities. He could not abide my Lady Mora. "Since they have made me Chancellor, and your Lordship approves them in so doing"—he wrote the day after he had news of his appointment—"I will begin to take them to task." Two provosts successively held office during his Chancellorship, Robert Usher, a kinsman of the Irish Primate, and a man of slight merit, and William Chappell, Dean of Cashel, a "very worthy person," who "begot a mighty reformation among them." During the latter provostship the college was greatly increased, and the Deputy himself did his utmost to encourage it by entering his son William, a little boy of eleven.

Laud's measures may be thus briefly summarized. He procured new statutes under the Great Seal. By these the number of Visitors (a source of considerable

confusion and contention) was reduced to two—himself as Chancellor, and the Archbishop of Dublin. The appointment of Vice-Chancellor was given to the Chancellor, to whom also all cases of moment were to be referred, and who was given power to appoint to a Senior Fellowship when the Board failed to fill it up. The Fellowships were made tenable for life under the usual conditions, and further powers were conferred on the Crown. These changes, it will be seen, were all designed simply to give the college the organization of the older Universities, and to prevent the anarchy which naturally arose in an ill-regulated oligarchy of scholars. Laud did his best to raise the standard of Irish education in Dublin by recommending to Fellowships several Irish scholars, and he encouraged the teaching of Irish in the college. "There is no doubt," says the latest historian of Trinity College, "of the wisdom which is conspicuous in Laud's emendation of the statutes, and of the excellent fruit which it afterwards produced in the growth and success of the college."[1] Trinity College was to be the intellectual training-ground for an Irish ministry, purged of the narrow Calvinism which was so hateful to their countrymen, and instructed in the doctrines of the Catholic Church to which the Irish were so loyal. That Irish Catholicism need not be Roman it was Laud's strenuous and persistent endeavour to show. And in this Strafford was of one heart and mind with him. They would substitute learning for vulgar invective, and the influence of personal piety for that of persecution.

[1] Stubbs, *Hist. Trinity College, Dublin*, p. 78. This statement is controverted, but with very small argument, by Mr. Urwick, *Early History of Trinity College, Dublin*, p. 36 *sqq.*

"I am most confident," wrote Laud, "that since the Reformation there was never any deputy in that kingdom intended the good of the Church so much as your lordship doth."

Strafford's own letters and the testimony of Carte show the condition of the Irish Church at the time of his appointment to the deputyship to have been deplorable. Many of the cathedrals were destroyed, and a great number of the parish churches ruined, unroofed, or unrepaired. The rapacity of the lay lords who carried out the Reformation had appropriated the tithes, most of which before the dissolution had belonged to religious houses; many were in private hands, others in those of the Crown. The bishoprics were wretchedly endowed—some paying no more than £50 a year; and "in the whole province of Connaught scarce a vicar's stipend exceeded forty shillings a year, and in many places only sixteen shillings." This account is substantiated by a graphic letter of Bramhall to Laud, August 10, 1633.[1]

Several of the Irish bishops were only waiting for some official encouragement from England to undertake in earnest the needed reformation of their dioceses. In January 1633 the Archbishop of Cashel wrote to Laud, begging that some steps might be taken for the restoration of "Church manses and glebes" to the incumbents, "a thing very necessary for the better plantation of the gospel by the residence of sufficient curates, by whom the daily service may be performed, and at least the children of the parish catechised."[2] This was in

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, 1633-4, p. 179.

[2] *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 12*th Report*, App., Part 2; Coke MSS. p. 2.

Laud's own spirit. He wrote to Wentworth[1] his wish "that the Divine Service may be read throughout the Churches, be the Company that vouchsafe to come never so few. Let God have His whole service with Reverence, and He will quickly send in more to help to perform it."

A Reformation in Ireland had not been called for as in England by national sentiment, by a revival of learning, and by the long growth of opposition to the Papacy. The Act of Supremacy was rejected by a Dublin Parliament of 1536, and, though it was afterwards carried, the reformed liturgy was only set forth by royal proclamation. Elizabeth's Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity were established by a packed Parliament. The Reformation in Ireland came from above; there was no popular feeling from below to meet it. Still, the leaders of the Irish Church had accepted the change, and Wentworth found an ecclesiastical body established in full communion with the English Church, though differing in its Articles and Canons. Both as the representative of Charles, and as himself a sincere Churchman, his action was natural. It may be traced in all its aspects in Laud's letters, with his replies—for Laud from the first took a keen missionary interest in the progress of the Irish Church. Its leading lines may be thus summarized.

Towards Romanists he adopted a policy of gentleness. He saw that persecution was no way to win over the recusants, or to build up a united Irish Church. He ceased to exact the irritating fines which Elizabethan policy levied on those who did not attend church. "This course," he wrote to Secretary Coke, "will never

[1] *Straff. Papers*, vol. i. p. 256.

bring them to church, being rather an engine to drain money out of their pockets than to raise a right belief and faith in their hearts." Laud wrote especially on this point to Bishop Bedell, assuring him of the wisdom of this mildness. It was accompanied by an endeavour to put forward the Irish Church as the national Church, and as holding all Catholic doctrines. Here Strafford acted with a firmness that bordered on despotism. The Lambeth Articles had been passed in Ireland in 1616, mainly under Usher's influence. They were Calvinistic and anti-sacerdotal. Several of them "gave great offence to the Roman Catholics and hindered their conversion, and others of them gave as much encouragement to the Puritans brought out of Scotland into Ulster: and both made their advantage of them to the prejudice of the Church of Ireland." Strafford would have the English Articles instead. It was a sharp piece of business. Convocation was reluctant, and the Primate timid; but Strafford triumphed, and the English Articles were accepted unanimously. "I have gone herein with an upright heart, to prevent a breach, seeming indeed, between the Churches of England and Ireland."

To the Articles were added Canons designed to establish the Catholicism of the Church, and there was talk of the establishment of a High Commission to enforce them. But such measures could not materially assist an unworthy hierarchy. The episcopate was therefore enriched by learned and able men—Bedell, Bramhall, Chappell. Then began that line of distinguished bishops which has been the pride of the Irish Church to this day. But Strafford and Laud worked below as well as above. New schools were

built, and new endowments given to education. The financial difficulty was the greatest which the reformers had to meet. In Ulster as well as in Connaught the clergy were wretchedly poor. A Commission was appointed to remedy the evil. But the great work of Laud and Strafford was the restoration of the impropriated tithes. "That in the great cause of the impropriations which are yet remaining in his Majesty's gift," wrote Laud on April 30, 1633, "and which he is most willing to give back to God and His service, you will do whatsoever may justly be done for the honour and service of your two great masters, God and the King, that you would countenance and assist the Lord Primate of Armagh in all things belonging to this great service; and particularly for the procuring of a true and just valuation of them, that the King may know what he gives to the Church. I pray, my Lord, be hearty in this, for I shall think myself very happy if God be pleased to spare my life to see this business ended." The great desire of the Archbishop was fulfilled, and the whole of the tithes impropriated by the Crown were restored to the Church.

It is a curious instance of the readiness of his accusers to take up any stone to cast at him, that on his trial this matter of the impropriations was styled "robbing the King." The answer was easy, as was that to the complaint of the increase of Popery. "Is there a better way to hinder this growth than to place an able clergy among the inhabitants? Can an able clergy be had without means? Is any means fitter than impropriations restored? My Lords, I did this as holding it the best means to keep down Popery, and to advance the Protestant religion. And I wish with

all my heart I had been able to do it sooner, before so many impropriations were gotten from the Crown into private hands."

Private persons were not so amenable to the Archbishop's or the Deputy's influence. "I foresee," said Strafford, "this is so universal a disease that I shall incur a number of men's displeasure of the best rank among them. But were I not better to lose these for God Almighty's sake than lose Him for theirs?"

In spite of the difficulties Strafford's "thorough" succeeded, and he left the Irish Church richer by £30,000 a year than he found it. "Thorough" in its conduct as well as in its aims the policy certainly was. The Earl of Cork, whose huge family tomb blocked up the east end of S. Patrick's where the altar should have been, had to remove it in spite of all his protests and his indignation. He wrote to Laud: the reply was courteous, but firm. In a few weeks Strafford reported that the Earl had taken the whole of it away. "How he means to dispose of it I know not; but up it is put in boxes, as if it were marchpanes and banqueting stuffs going down to the christening of my young master in the country." The bishops were no more gently treated than the lay lords when they opposed the Deputy's policy. When Bishop Adair of Killala approved the Covenant he was deposed.

A policy like this had undoubted defects. It had all the appearance of Erastianism, though it is true that Laud's policy was never to subordinate the Church to the State. Its aim was to give the Irish Church just that form of restorative stimulus which it had never received—a "goodly and thorough Reformation." But unhappily the projects for Church reform were

linked to those baleful theories of English political action which Elizabeth had made traditional in Ireland, which the Stewarts rather modified than abandoned, and which Cromwell and William III. were to make a cause of irreconcilable international hatred. Laud had to act in Ireland through the arm of the State, and his Church policy thus became identified in appearance with the most questionable of the proceedings of Wentworth. Yet all through, the Archbishop, though acting through the State, felt his work to be stifled by it. The Canon Law, he complained to the Bishop of Kilmore, had "been so blasted in these kingdoms" that almost any ill custom contrary to it will have strength to prevail; and to Strafford, "as for the Church, it is so bound up in the forms of the Common Law that it is not possible for me, or for any man, to do that good which he would do or is bound to do. For your lordship sees, no man clearer, that they which have gotten so much power over the Church will not let go their hold: they have indeed, fangs with a witness, whatsoever I was once said in passion to have."

Still, in spite of its defects, the policy was not without good result. It raised the tone of the Irish clergy, as well as re-endowed the Church. It did something, though but little, to stem that torrent of Puritanism, the fear of which did so much to arouse the terrible revolt of 1641.

From Ireland to Scotland in the seventeenth century is a far cry. Across the Tweed there was no phantom of English ascendency to preserve, no traditional blood feud to overcome. The nation was proud and jealous of its independence: neither barons, clergy, nor people

could be hectored into submission. Above all, it had undergone a Reformation which, whether godly or not, was unmistakably thorough, and the Reformation had produced a hierarchy more powerful and despotic than England had ever known, and fostered a type of character which was strange and repugnant to men of Southern race.

There can be no better introduction to the Scots troubles in which Laud was so prominent an actor than the words of Clarendon, which, though not strictly accurate, show so clearly the strength, and the limitations, of the great outburst of Scots feeling. "The Scotch nation," he says, "how capable soever it was of being led by some great men and misled by the clergy, would have been corrupted by neither into a barefaced rebellion against their King, whose person they loved and reverenced his government; nor could they have been wrought upon towards the lessening the one or the other by any other suggestions or infusions, than such as should make them jealous or apprehensive of a design to introduce Popery; their whole religion consisting in an entire detestation of Popery, in believing the Pope to be Antichrist, and hating perfectly the persons of all papists—and I doubt all others who did not hate them."

Interesting and significant though the history of the religious change in Scotland is throughout, we need not look back further than the beginning of the century to see the particular set of circumstances with which Charles and Laud had to deal.

James's earlier years had proved to the full the difficulties which the Reformation had introduced into Scots politics. "Presbytery," said the King—it was

the result of many years' bitter experience—"agreeth as well with monarchy as God and the devil." In 1599, after years of labour and intrigue, he appointed three ministers to vote in Parliament with the title of bishops. Step by step, with infinite patience, varied by sudden fits of masterful energy, he proceeded till he had obtained the consent of various packed Assemblies to the appointment of "constant moderators" of the Assemblies, officers of ecclesiastical status whose position should be permanent: these were the titular bishops. From this the transition to a legal episcopacy was no great matter. In 1610, an Assembly at Glasgow gave to these officers power to excommunicate, and to institute and deprive, and directed that oaths of obedience to them should be taken by those appointed to benefices. The time was come to add to their position the weight of the apostolic sanction. To this end Spottiswoode, Archbishop of Glasgow, Lamb, Bishop of Brechin, and Hamilton, Bishop of Galloway, were summoned to England, and received consecration by the hands of Abbot, Andrewes, Neile, and Parry. On their return to Scotland they consecrated other bishops, and Scotland again had an apostolic ministry. For the time the King's action provoked no open resistance. "The new bishops," says the Presbyterian Calderwood, "were become so awful with their grandeur and the King's assistance, that there was little resistance to them, howbeit great murmuring and malcontentment."

The Scots Church could not, however, be regarded to be yet in happy plight. James desired to provide for the permanent endowment of the clergy who had been stripped and spoiled by the greedy lords who carried through the Reformation; and he hoped to

give the Church a bond of union in a new liturgy. In 1617 he succeeded in the former aim. He procured the settlement of a regular stipend upon the ministers, and by securing local payments freed the clergy from the precarious charity of an impoverished general fund. Scotland had suffered the worst that Disestablishment brings with it. James again brought religious ministrations within the reach of all. His second intention was not so easily carried out. Few would now question either James's sagacity or his good intentions, but all must admit the rashness of his measures. His methods were thoroughly Erastian. Nothing more intolerable to Scots sentiment could be conceived, nor anything more certain in the long run to cause the failure of the scheme. Thus early indeed we may see at work that fatal characteristic of the ecclesiastical policy of the later Stewarts—its inseparable connection with the aims and the machinery of the State. The real cause of the failure of the policy of James, of Charles, and of Laud, when it was applied to the Scots Church, was not its opposition to the popular will—for there are not wanting signs that the people were becoming reconciled to Episcopacy and Church order[1]—but the fact that it was forced upon the ministers, who had become the real leaders of the hardy Scots, by the power of the autocratic State, and that a power now coming to the nation with a more and more foreign aspect. Typical of James's measures was an act introduced into the Scots Parliament in 1617, to provide that "whatever his Majesty should determine in the external government of the Church, with the advice of the archbishops,

[1] See Mr. Sprott's valuable introduction to his *Scottish Liturgies, &c.* (Edinb. 1871), p. lxvii.

bishops, and a competent number of the ministry, should have the force of law." That he was forced to withdraw it should have taught the King wisdom, but he marched on to the destruction of his whole system.

Various tentative steps were taken towards the admission of a liturgy. The Articles of Perth—which were passed by the Assembly under the strongest pressure from the Crown—provided for kneeling at the Holy Eucharist, and for the permissive restoration of private baptism and communion for the sick. Confirmation and the observance of festivals also resumed place in the decent order of the Church.

After this, a service-book was compiled, but was not enforced. James became fully occupied by his English difficulties, by foreign intrigues and Parliamentary opposition; and it was not till his son turned his attention to the northern kingdom that the Church in Scotland underwent any further changes at the hands of those who would bring her to their own model.

When Charles visited Edinburgh in 1633, his fixed intent was to introduce a service-book. Laud accompanied him as Dean of the Chapel Royal. It was not his first visit to Scotland. In 1617 he attended Neile as one of his chaplains when James went north. He then made acquaintance with the chief Churchmen, notably Dr. Forbes, who in 1633 became Bishop of Edinburgh. He was a witness of all the proceedings of the Perth Assembly, but left no record of his impressions. Even in that short visit he had aroused indignation, by wearing a surplice at the funeral of one of the King's Scots Guards.

He came now with a mind made up, like the King,

to bring the Scots Church into complete harmony with the English. "The worst thought I had," he said at his trial, when they charged him with plotting against the Kirk, "was to wish it like the English; and so much the better as it would please God to make it." Yet he was far from proceeding precipitately. The King was crowned in Holy Rood with solemn ceremonial,[1] and Laud turned back a bishop who disobeyed the King's order to wear his "whites." The Scots saw a dignified service and heard a fixed liturgy. There was no more.

Then came the demand for Canons. How was the Church to be governed without rules? The Scots bishops drew up Canons, and by the King's direction sent them to Laud. He revised them, but, as he was careful to declare at his trial, with Juxon's aid. There was, indeed, no reason why he should be anxious to work alone at the matter. His letters to the Scots bishops show him eager that the work should be theirs, not his: yet as to the lines on which it should proceed he was clear and firm. The bishops, indeed, were ready to lead, not to follow him: it was the people to whom the proposals were anathema. The Scots' charges against him at his trial, descending to the mere childishness of details in these Canons, show how deep was the divergence concerning matters about which it would now seem the veriest trifling to wrangle.

The Archbishop of S. Andrews and a number of the bishops writing to him in 1635[2] say, "They have

[1] I have not space to discuss the interesting details of the coronation (see *Coron. of Charles I.*, Henry Bradshaw Society, p. xxvi *sqq.*). Laud was admitted of the Scots Privy Council June 15, 1633 (*Cal. State Papers*, 1633-4, p. 100).

[2] *Cal. State Papers*, 1635, p. 4.

made a further progress than could have been expected in many years, and hope to still go forward, if the Archbishop do return in health and life." Laud showed no desire to hurry the progress; he endorsed the letter. "Conformity must be a work of time."

"Our prelates have not the boldness to trouble us in their canons, with altars, fonts, chancels, reading of a long liturgy before sermons, etc. But Canterbury is punctual and peremptory in all these"—was a serious charge in the eyes of his accusers. His answer, with its quaint ironical humour, would seem to them but unseemly jesting.[1]

"What's the crime which 'prelates had not the boldness to trouble you with,' and in which Canterbury, that strange man, is so 'punctual and peremptory'? *O! grave crimen Caie Caesar!* 'Tis a charge indeed, indeed—a mighty charge! a 'novation' of above thirteen hundred years old."

"I was no 'master of this work,'" he said, "but a servant to it, and commanded thereunto by his sacred Majesty."[2] Such, and such-like, "wicked intentions" of "Canterbury and Ross" did not escape comment at the time.

The next step was the issue of a Book of Common Prayer. It was a necessary consequence of what had gone before: and here again the work was that of the Scots bishops. "I ever did desire," said Laud very truly, "it might come to them with their own liking and approbation. Nay, I did ever, upon all occasions, call upon the Scottish bishops to do nothing in this particular but by warrant of law. And further, I professed unto them before his Majesty that though

[1] *Works*, iii. 327. [2] *Ibid.*, iii. 317.

I had obeyed his commands in helping to order that book, yet, since I was ignorant of the laws of that kingdom, I would have nothing at all to do with the manner of introducing it, but left that wholly to them who do, or should, understand both that Church and their laws."[1] Yet the book, though it was the Scots' in beginning, was certainly largely Laud's in carrying out, and received the most careful revision from him and the bishops of his opinion. His own copy of the book, now in the library of the city of Norwich—another copy is at Lambeth—contains his careful interlineations. It was to be "as near that of England as might be." Yet the bishops themselves desired that there should be differences, both because it seemed easier to content the Scots with a book which was their own than with an attempt to introduce the English form, and because the "order of the prayers" was the better and the "more agreeable to the use in the primitive Church." No doubt a chief cause of the failure of this ill-fated endeavour was the mistaken way in which it was attempted to carry it through. Again and again, in his letters to Strafford, Laud complains of the folly and perverseness of the Scots bishops, and of the traitorous counsels of the King's political advisers in Scotland. Indeed, till the time when it should have been publicly used, all went smoothly. In May 1637 Laud was writing to the city of Edinburgh as to the care of S. Giles's and to other church buildings.[2]

It was not till July 23, 1637, when the service book was used for the first time in S. Giles's Cathedral, that the

[1] *Works*, iii. 336.

[2] This letter, which is in my possession, was printed in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, October 1892.

tumult burst forth. The scene is historic, though some of its details are apocryphal. Amid the crash of broken windows, and the hurtling of stools, the service was completed: but the next day its use was suspended till the King's will was known. Charles's obstinacy—"I mean to be obeyed"—had no effect against the rising indignation of the Scots. It became more than ever clear to them that this new book was being forced upon them by the State power and by the English government. Disturbance became riot, and riot rebellion. The Common Prayer was met by the Covenant —and the national war broke out, which swept away every vestige of ecclesiastical order, which set alight the smouldering discontent in England, and which, in its conclusion at the treaty of Ripon, left Charles, for the time at least, powerless in the hands of his opponents.

The rising of Scots nationalism was against Erastianism and against England: but it was much more —it was a genuine assertion of extreme Protestant doctrine, which had won its way to the minds and hearts of the people, against the danger, which their experience did not lead them to consider illusory, of Romanism. Primitive Christianity was too near Rome to be safe—and the Prayer-Book itself took its characteristics from the liturgies of the earliest days of the Christian past.

Men had now had time to look clearly on doctrine and worship, apart from the storm and stress of the Reformation movements. A school of liturgiologists had arisen, to whom the English forms were meagre and incomplete, and to whom it seemed possible, without going beyond what the English Prayer-Book admitted, to present to the

ecclesiastics and antiquaries of Europe a liturgy which should be deficient in no primitive expression of Catholic truth. Thus in the Eucharistic service stress was laid upon the Christian sacrifice. "The priest shall offer up and place the bread and wine prepared for the Sacrament on the Lord's Table," says Laud's MS.; and the offering is a memorial of the Lord's "precious death and *sacrifice*." And the primitive invocation of the Holy Ghost is restored at consecration: "Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and of Thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son." So also no loophole for Zwinglianism is left in the words of administration: the second clause of the English form, put into the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI., is excised. These alterations, and such as these, undoubtedly brought the service more into accord with primitive usage; and that seemed to Laud a sufficient authority.[1] He was never able to understand the position of those who wished to escape from primitive tradition and Church order. To him the past was the very ground of his belief and his worship; forms were supports, not bondages. The Scots' view

[1] At his trial he said, "Though I shall not find fault with the order of the prayers as they stand in the Communion-book of England (for, God be thanked, 'tis well), yet if a comparison must be made, I do think the order of the prayers, as now they stand in the Scottish Liturgy, to be the better and more agreeable to use in the primitive Church; and, I believe, they which are learned will acknowledge it" (*Works*, iii. 344). Again, "As for the oblation of the elements, that's fit and proper; and I am sorry for my part that it is not in the book of England" (*Ibid.*, iii. 359).

was utterly opposed to this: they had found a new world of religious thought, and they clung to its expression with irresistible tenacity. But the Scots Revolution was not wholly religious. It was a popular uprising inspired by fierce hatred against the Royal power, which sought to hurry the people along a path which they were not yet prepared to tread. It was an aristocratic movement led by selfish politicians who dreaded the strengthening of the monarchy. It was the expression of the feeling, narrow but intense, of the clergy, who had become the masters of the people. "Of liberty of thought these Scottish preachers neither knew anything nor cared to know anything. . . . . Spiritual and mental freedom would have one day to be learnt from England."[1] Thus the antagonism of the Scots to the Laudian movement was twofold. It was to them at once too conservative in its foundations and too liberal in its outlook. The very merits of its ideal, no less than the glaring defects of the methods by which men sought to enforce it, caused its unhesitating and unalterable rejection.

An interesting illustration of Scots feeling is to be found in a long letter of the Earl of Argyll to the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated February 28, 1639.[2] "With your lordship's favour," he says, "I believe you shall find that the complaint of the Presbytery your lordship mentions, which we call our Church or General Assembly, is concerning very essential differences betwixt the Reformed Church and that of Rome; and so far only against bishops as they transgress the laws

[1] Gardiner, *Hist. Engl.*, vol. viii. p. 374.

[2] *Hist. MSS. Comm., Report XII.*, App., Part 2, Coke MSS., p. 213, in answer to a letter of Laud's of November 25, 1638.

and lawful constitutions of this Church and kingdom. . . . . So with your lordship's good leave, I must say still your lordship is mistaken if you think the book that was offered and pressed here was only the English service, for in the very reading any man may see the contrary. Yet truly I think all his Majesty's subjects ought to thank God for his Majesty's paternal care of his own children, and as all (I hope) do acknowledge it to proceed from his Majesty's own goodness, so I believe they are the loather to come under the hands of indiscreet pedants or rude task-masters, that want the affection and moderation of a father." The letter is a plain enough direction to the English to mind their own business. It bases the Scots forms of worship and Church order on Scripture alone. "It seems they desire rather to be like Moses, who would not suffer any to remain in Egypt, lest it should give occasion to return."

In Scotland, where the aim rather than the measures had been his, Laud saw for the first time the decisive failure of his policy. His gradual awakening to the failure is to be traced almost pathetically in his letters. Most of all was he distressed that the good intentions of his master should be mistaken and misliked. Charles clung to the Episcopal order to the last: he would cut down their powers, circumscribe their action, till they became like the Culdee bishops whom the Scots had known of old in their earlier home; but he would not consent to their abolition. This was no struggle for the appearance of victory—it was a stand for the essentials of the Catholic Church. So it appeared to Charles and to Laud: but the time was past to save anything from the wreck, and the triumph of the

Scots army but foreshadowed the fate of the English Church.

Misfortune dogged every step which Laud took in Scotland and Ireland. Yet the completeness of the failure should not blind us to the greatness of the aim. He longed to see a great communion recognizing its unity in the Church, as the kingdoms that owned the sway of James and Charles recognized the links which bound them together. But when political bonds were snapping it was no time to knit with ecclesiastical ties. What earlier or later in the history of the kingdoms might have won success, was in the seventeenth century at best but a visionary ideal. Something to oppose to the menacing ostentation of the Roman obedience was what Laud sought—a great Anglican unity firm in the faith of the undivided Church, primitive in doctrine, apostolic in ministry, restrained and sanctified in individual life. It was a great ideal, but it took no count of the times and men. It fell inevitably, yet even while it fell it did good work. The Church in Scotland and Ireland to-day cannot but look back to Laud as one of the greatest of its benefactors.

CHAPTER VII.

TROUBLES, TRIAL, AND DEATH.

In the year 1640 Laud's troubles began in earnest. The Scots war brought to a head all the discontent that was smouldering in England. Political grievances were supported by religious disorder; and the insurrection in the North, which so boldly placed religion in the forefront of its complaints, drew to itself the sympathy of all those in England who were seeking to change the constitution in Church or State.

The bold action of Convocation in 1640 was the last effort and the last evidence of Laud's power. It was significant that the House had to be protected in its session by a military force, and that Charles hurried on the conclusion of its proceedings because he saw the daily increasing animosity which was aroused by the sight of the guard which surrounded the Churchmen in council. When the King left for the North, Laud, with the rest of the Privy Council who did not go to the war, was placed in charge of the government, "with orders by all good ways to provide for the safety of the kingdom and people."[1] In the great debate of the

[1] *Cal. State Papers*, Sept. 2, 1640.

Council on Scots affairs four months before, he had spoken boldly. "Tried all ways and refused all ways, by the law of God you should have subsistence, and ought to have it, and lawfully to take it."[1] *Lawfully,* he still believed, the King was acting, and when Parliament was "peevish," and the Scots were menacing, he believed that there were other means by which the King could lawfully obtain supplies besides the grant of the House of Commons.

Every day the troubles thickened. Laud had news of a Popish plot, which one Habernfeld professed to have discovered, and which he revealed to the English Ambassador at the Hague (Sir William Boswell). The extraordinary tissue of absurdities which the story unfolded was not too strange to be credible to a generation which still remembered the Gunpowder Plot. It seemed to Laud a "great business,"[2] and Prynne, when he found the papers at Lambeth, served them up in his own style as an accusation against the Archbishop himself.

The difficulty of providing for the troops, the increasing successes of the Scots, the gallant struggle of Wentworth against overwhelming odds, and the intrigues and self-seeking which marred the efforts of the King's party,—all were felt in London, and Laud shared to the full in the troubles and the unpopularity.

Already he had learnt something of the feeling of London. On May 9, when Parliament had been dissolved,

[1] *Cal. State Papers.* Vane's notes, May 5, 1640.

[2] See *Cal. State Papers*, Sept. 11, 1640; Oct. 5—15, 1640. Prynne's *Rome's Masterpiece*, an ingenious falsification of the whole story, is reprinted, with Laud's MS. notes, in his *Works*, iv. 463 *sqq.*

and Convocation was still sitting, a paper had been posted on the Exchange, summoning all apprentices to meet the next holiday in S. George's Fields, and to sack the palace at Lambeth. Laud had warning, and the next day, Sunday, "a drum was beat up in Southwark, and charge given to the train band there to guard the Archbishop's house." [1] About twelve or one at night some five hundred rioters assembled, but after two hours were unable to force an entrance, "and God be thanked," wrote Laud in his Diary, "I had no harm." The attempt, however, had been made, and was widely talked of. It was reported that the Archbishop had been "compelled to take a grey cloak and escape over the Thames." [2] He had indeed slept the night at Whitehall. One of the ringleaders was executed; but the riots continued. The White Lion prison in Southwark was broken open, and prisoners were rescued from thence and from the King's Bench.

The Scots as they entered England were threatening vengeance on the Archbishop as "a raging tyrant and blood-sucking wolf." [3] The prentices were again being hired to fall on him during the King's absence, by fly-sheets scattered about the city. And, while the Great Council of Peers was debating at York, and when the richer citizens of London were coming forward to aid the King with money, a mob of "near two thousand Brownists" made tumult in the High Commission Court, then sitting in S. Paul's "because of the trouble of the times." They "tore down all the benches in the

[1] Woodford's Diary, in *Hist. MSS. Comm., Report IX.*, Appendix, p. 498.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] Letter in Prynne's *Hidden Works of Darkness*, pp. 187-8.

Consistory, and cried out that they would have no bishop, nor no High Commission."[1]

From that time the end was near. In nothing was the popular feeling more evident than in the enormous growth of broadsheets and pamphlets, libels and ballads, that were issued on every topic of current affairs.

As early as 1629 Laud had knowledge of the bitter hatred that was rising against him, through the libels that were printed and circulated through the land. On March 29 he wrote in his Diary—"Two papers were found in the Dean of Paul's his yard before his house. The one was to this effect, concerning myself: Laud, look to thyself; be assured thy life is sought. As thou art the fountain of all wickedness, repent thee of thy monstrous sins, before thou be taken out of the world, etc. And assure thyself, neither God nor the world can endure such a vile counsellor to live, or such a whisperer; or to this effect. The other was as bad as this, against the Lord Treasurer. Mr. Dean delivered both papers to the King that night. Lord, I am a grievous sinner; but I beseech Thee deliver my soul from them that hate me without a cause." From that day letters of accusation and fly-sheets, imputing every kind of crime, dogged his path. His Diary records some of the worst. His familiar letters comment on them, but always in the same tone of sorrow rather than anger. "The best is," he writes to Strafford in 1636, "they have called my Master by the worst name they have given me, and He has taught me how to bear it." Two years later it is the same. "Within this fortnight I have received four bitter libels. I only tell the King of them, and put them in my pocket."

[1] Diary, in *Works*, iii. 237.

"All to Westminster: newes from Elizium"; "Canterburie's Tooles, or Instruments wherewith he hath effected many rare feats and egregious exploits, as is very well known, and notoriously manifest to all men. Discovering his projects and policies, and the ends and purposes of the prelates in effecting their facinorous actions and enterprises"; "Rome for Canterbury, or a true relation of the Birth and Life of William Laud"; "Rome's ABC"; "Canterbury's Will"; "Canterburie's Amazement, or the Ghost of the Young Fellow Thomas Bensted, who appeared to him in the Tower"; "A Parallel between Thomas Wolsey, Archbishop of York, and William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury"; "Canterburie's Dreame" (a vision of Wolsey); "Mercurie's Message, or the Coppy of a Letter sent to William Laud, late Archbishop of Canterbury, now prisoner in the Tower." These are a few of those which came out in 1641. The list is endless. Many of them show a coarse humour: many more a savage bitterness. It is pathetic to see them in Lambeth Library, carefully kept and noted, with the date and manner in which they reached him. They became so common that he grew to treat them often with a spice of their own humour. "WILLIAM LAUDE—WELL AM A DIVIL," says one foolish anagram. The Archbishop wrote below—

> "He y^{t} of this would better English make,
> Shall find a task will make his brain to ake."

Perhaps the foulest of them all—but it is ill setting precedence in such a matter—is "Canterbury's Will, with a Serious Conference between his Scrivener and him," printed in 1641, after his imprisonment, which threatens his death by hanging, and makes the usual

accusations against him. "Dost thou not hear," he is made to say, "as thou walkest along the streets, how each school-boy's mouth is filled with a *Give Little Laud to the Devill?*"

Another, of no little interest, is "The Recantation of the Prelate of Canterbury, being his last *Advice* to his Brethren the Bishops of England to consider his Fall, observe the Times, forsake their wayes, and to joyne in their good work of Reformation." In this Laud is made to confess his design of erecting a hierarchy which should rule England, and sow the seeds of Arminianism, superstition, and Popery, and to give himself up to despair and penitence. One passage, as he read it in the Tower, may have well startled him by the confidence with which it predicted that it would be impossible now to recover, or to avoid the extreme penalty.

"We have already," he was made to say, "received sentence from the House of Commons; their wisdom and justice have pronounced the people's mind, and denounced the kingdom's pleasure. And though the influence of some frolick faction (now fugitive as our hopes are) should yet a little prolong the life of our expectation, and entertain us with a possibility of wrestling through, tell me if ever any person did thrive being once condemned by them. It is certainly a great loss, not to have the Parliament's affection, and very hard, as they say, to sit in Rome and strive against the Pope. No, no, Nature and Grace, Time and Fortune, have taken such a good course to destroy us, that it is impossible we can be saved without a miracle."[1]

[1] P. 38. For this interesting libel I am indebted to the kind-

The writer had indeed hit upon the reason which made escape impossible. Though the Commons might be compelled by the pressure of military and civil difficulties to delay for years the settlement of their great quarrel with the Archbishop, it was the war itself which made it impossible that his life should ultimately be spared. As the fratricidal strife more and more embittered the feelings of the combatants, the English Erastians began to feel, as the Scots had long felt, an unquenchable personal hatred against the great surviving exponent of the Stewart policy in Church and State, while those who might have preserved his life were scattered over all England when the fatal hour arrived. Slowly the libellers came to represent the feelings of those who had the power to strike, and then Laud's death was inevitable.

But to return to the period when the popular cries were first finding expression in the literature of the street. Libels such as these were constant in the autumn of 1640. Abroad and at home the air seemed full of omens against the Archbishop. He was still busy with his works of generosity, sending the last of his magnificent gift of MSS. to his loved University. One night he found his picture, "taken by the life" in Vandyke's studio if not entirely by his own hand,[1] "fallen down upon the face and lying on the floor, the string being broken by which it was hanged against the wall." Even his stalwart heart was startled. "I am almost every day threatened with my ruin in

---

ness of 'A Romish Recusant.' The portrait of Laud which it contains has been reproduced as the frontispiece of his own interesting life of Laud.

[1] The picture still hangs at Lambeth.

Parliament," he wrote; "God grant this be no omen."[1]

The Long Parliament met on Tuesday, November 3. From that date events moved quickly. On the 11th Strafford was impeached; on December 4 Laud was examined as to his friend's speeches in the Privy Council; on the 10th Windebanke fled; on the 16th the new Canons were condemned in the House of Commons, and Laud was named as the author of them, and in the House of Lords the Scots Commissioners accused him by name as "an incendiary." On Friday, December 18, he was formally impeached of High Treason by the Commons, and charged further by the Scots Commissioners. No particular articles were alleged; these it was said should follow in convenient time.

Within six weeks the face of English affairs had been completely changed. Charles had lost his two most devoted servants. No one raised a finger to save them. Terror seemed to have fallen on the Court as the Commons became the masters of the State.

Laud was committed to the custody of the Usher of the Black Rod, Mr. Maxwell, till the charges against him should be particularized. He was allowed to spend a few hours for the last time at Lambeth, taking a few books and materials for his defence. "I stayed at Lambeth till the evening," is the touching entry in his Diary, "to avoid the gazing of the people. I went to evening prayer in my chapel. The psalms of the day, Psalms 93 and 94, and chapter 50 of Esai, gave me great comfort. God make me worthy of it, and fit to receive it. As I went to my barge, hundreds of my

[1] Diary, *Works*, iii. 237.

poor neighbours stood there and prayed for my safety and return to my house. For which I bless God and them." He had some little talk with his steward and other faithful friends, who felt with him the comfort of the psalms "Dominus regnavit" and "Deus ultionum": he could study in them again the power of the Almighty and the comforts of the righteous. "Blessed is the man whom Thou chastenest, O Lord, and teachest him in Thy law: that Thou mayest give him patience in time of adversity. . . . In the multitude of the sorrows that I had in my heart Thy comforts have refreshed my soul." Every day after he read over these psalms again for the comfort he then received.

Special prayer, which had been his habitual solace in times of distress, was now his resort. On the day of his imprisonment, perhaps during his last hours at Lambeth, he wrote down the words in which he commended his cause to God—"O eternal God and merciful Father, I humbly beseech Thee look down upon me in this time of my great and grievous affliction. Lord, if it be Thy blessed will, make mine innocency appear, and free both me and my profession from all scandal thus raised on me. And howsoever, if Thou be pleased to try me to the uttermost, I humbly beseech Thee give me full patience, proportionable comfort, contentment with whatsoever Thou sendest, and an heart ready to die for Thy honour, the King's happiness, and the Church's preservation. And my zeal to these is all the sin yet known to me in this particular for which I thus suffer. Lord, look upon me in mercy, and for the merits of Jesus Christ pardon all my sins many and great, which have drawn down this judgment upon me; and then in all things do Thou

with me as seems best in Thine own eyes, and make me not only patient under, but thankful for whatsoever Thou doest, O Lord my Strength and my Redeemer. Amen." [1]

He could rest at peace in his trust in God and with the love of the poor. He remained for ten weeks in the custody of Maxwell, "during which time he gained so much on the good opinion of the gentlewoman of the house, that she reported him to some of her gossips to be one of the goodest men and most pious souls, but withal one of the silliest fellows to hold talk with a lady that ever she met with in all her life." [2] In the house of Black Rod he would hear all that was happening without; and strange news indeed it must have seemed to one who had never understood how the times were moving. He was fined £500 for his imprisonment of Sir Robert Howard,[3] and made to pay the money at once. Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick were released and received with triumph in London. Williams was set at liberty, and "more honoured by the Lords and Commons than ever any of his order, his person looked upon as sacred, his words deemed as oracles." [4] Changes among the judges, resolutions against ship-money, orders on public worship, "root and branch" propositions, and the signs of severance between the men who had been united when the Parliament began—these might cause hope and fear to alternate day by day in Laud's ever buoyant mind.

At last, on February 26, 1640, fourteen articles were

[1] *Works*, iii. 84.
[2] Heylin, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, p. 405.
[3] See above, p. 102.
[4] Heylin, p. 464.

brought up by the Commons against him, and he was sent for to the bar of the Lords to hear them. He made a spirited reply. False he was declared to be to God, the King, and the people; and that with no particular proof but a general accusation. "It is not possible for any man," he answered, "to be true to the King, as King, that shall be found treacherous to the State established by law, and work to the subversion of the people." Most nearly of all did he feel it that he should be charged with falseness in religion: "but for corruption in the least degree I fear no accuser that will speak the truth."

The articles touched upon every point of the policy in Church or State that was associated with his name. He had subverted the fundamental laws. "What were they?" was his answer; and he stood, as always, on the judgment of the lawyers themselves in each case. He had, it was said, procured the publication of assertions of arbitrary power; he had perverted justice in the law-courts; he had taken bribes and sold justice; he had traitorously published canons contrary to the King's prerogative and the people's rights; he had assumed a papal and tyrannical power in contempt of the Royal Supremacy; he had endeavoured to alter God's true religion by law established in the realm, and set up popish superstition and idolatry; he had abused the power and patronage given him, and the licensing of books; he had confederated with Jesuits, and deprived godly ministers; he had endeavoured to cause dissensions between the Church of England and "other reformed Churches"; he had stirred up strife between England and Scotland; and he had laboured to incense the King against the people and the people

against the King :—and all these charges were made to sound the more grievous by the addition of the word "traitorously" to each.

Laud may well have been astonished at the list, as it is plain he was. Yet he answered with courage and patience to each article, premising nevertheless that general charges were worthless, and that he could reply in detail to any particular evidence or allegation.

His answer made, the Lords committed him to the Tower, whither he was brought three days later, on March 1, 1641. As he passed through the city the prentices raised a shout, and a crowd assembled. "And so they followed me with clamour and revilings, even beyond barbarity itself; not giving over till the coach was entered in at the Tower gate. Mr. Maxwell, out of his love and care, was exceedingly troubled at it; but I bless God for it, my patience was not moved: I looked upon a higher cause than the tongues of Shimei and his children." Safe there, it might seem that he was forgotten, for while the tide surged outside, while Strafford was beheaded, and the war began, he still remained in prison. It was not till three years later that he was actually brought to trial.

He petitioned for a copy of the charge against him, and that he might have counsel. The Lords ordered that he should have such counsel as were not of counsel to the Earl of Strafford, and that he and the Earl of Strafford should not be suffered to come together in the Tower. In the Tower he betook himself to writing that pathetic memoir, the *History of his Troubles*. He noted down what he heard of the proceedings of Parliament, where day by day his cherished reforms were being destroyed. He recorded in the expressive

brevity of a severe restraint what he knew of the last hours of the friend who had been as his other self in the service of Church and King. The pathos of the words cannot suffer from their constant repetition. It is a classic passage in the literature of affliction.

"His lordship, being to suffer on the Wednesday morning, did upon Tuesday in the afternoon desire the Lord Primate of Armagh, then with him, to come to me, and desire me that I would not fail to be at my chamber window at the open casement the next morning, when he was to pass by it as he went to execution; that though he might not speak with me, yet he might see me, and take his last leave of me. I sent him word I would, and did so. And the next morning as he passed by, he turned towards me, and took the solemnest leave that I think was ever by any at distance taken one of another; and this in the sight of the Earl of Newport, then Lord Constable of the Tower; the Lord Primate of Armagh, the Earl of Cleveland, the Lieutenant of the Tower, and divers other knights and gentlemen of worth. Besides, during the time of our restraints, and the nearness of our lodgings, we held no intercourse each with other; yet Sir W. Balfore, then Lieutenant of the Tower, told me often what frequent and great expressions of love the Earl made to me . . . But I leave that honourable person in his grave, and while I live shall honour his memory."

The old man fainted as he gave his blessing to his staunch friend. When he came to himself he said to those around him, "that he hoped by God's assistance, and his own innocency, that when he came to his own execution (which he daily longed for) the world should perceive he had been more sensible of the Lord

Strafford's loss than of his own: and good reason it should be so (said he), for the gentleman was more serviceable to the Church (he would not mention the State) than either himself or any of all the Churchmen had ever been." It was indeed, as Heylin adds, "a gallant farewell to so eminent and beloved a friend."

From the day of Strafford's execution Laud, it is clear, gave up hope of life; but he preserved his courage unaltered, and thought only to prove his innocence to posterity if he could not to his judges. His prayers in prison are in the Psalmist's words of confidence and trust.

News reached him of the strange changes that so rapidly succeeded each other outside. The King in November feasted in London, in January was scouted on all hands for his attempt to arrest the five members. Williams, his old rival, at one moment the idol of the Parliamentary party, and the base adviser of the King to consent to Strafford's death, was before the end of the year committed, with eleven other bishops, to the Tower for their protest against their practical exclusion from Parliament. The Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission were abolished, and the whole machinery of personal government dislocated. For himself, his jurisdiction in certain particulars was sequestered, and he resigned his Chancellorship of Oxford in a dignified and pathetic letter of farewell. Ballads were sung up and down the streets of him. He could hear them, it may be, in prison. "The new year of the bishops' fear," as one libel called it,[1] found the prentices crying—

[1] *The Apprentices' Advice to the XII. Bishops*, 1642.

"Go twelve Apostates, not Apostles, view,
Your Arch Guil. Cant. the head o' th' damned crew,
Who hath his King, country, and State betray'd,
And to be hang'd with you hath so long stayd."

When he could get to service he was preached against "with vehemency becoming Bedlam," he writes, with something of his old spirit, of one Joslin, on May 15, 1642, "with treason sufficient to hang him in any other state, and with such particular abuse to me, that women and boys stood up in the church to see how I could bear it." There was still no stirring for his trial; but from time to time orders reached him from the Lords as to appointments to benefices. Lambeth was placed in charge of a military guard, "to keep it for the public service," and his goods were sold. For a time visitors were allowed to see him, and among them there came one who seemed to lure him to incriminate himself by speaking against Parliament.[1] Usher was often allowed to be with him, and they spoke no doubt of the last hours of Strafford. It seemed as if at one time the Commons would not have been sorry that he should escape. He wrote to Pococke of the chance, but said he scorned to fly.[2] Rumours reached him too that he should be sent to New England,[3] and the suggestion indeed was actually debated in the Commons, but was rejected. Since his imprisonment began he had been allowed to walk for a short space daily alone. But at length an order came against this, that he might not go out without his keeper,[4] "so much as to take the air."

Before the end of the month he suffered a more

[1] Diary, Feb. 20, 1642.
[2] Twells, *Life of Pococke*, p. 84.
[3] Diary, March 24, 1643.
[4] *Ibid.*, May 10, 1643.

grievous outrage. An order was issued by the Commons that all the prisoners in the Tower should be searched for letters and other papers. Just as Leighton had been set to search Lambeth, Prynne was commissioned to deal with Laud himself. Early in the morning of May 31, 1643, when the Archbishop was still in bed, and his servants had not risen, his "implacable enemy," having left sentries without, entered his room with three musketeers, their muskets at full cock, and began to rifle his pockets. Laud was soon up, and, half-dressed, stood by while the search proceeded. The papers he had prepared for his defence were taken from him—the King's letters about a vacant benefice, the Scots service-book, his own Diary, and even his book of private prayers. "Nor could I get him," he says, "to leave this last; but he must needs see what passed between God and me, a thing I think scarce ever offered to any Christian." Having searched up and down, in cupboards and boxes, the eager Prynne peeped even into a bundle of gloves, of which Laud gave him a pair, and at last went his way with the spoil. "I was somewhat troubled to see myself used in this way," is all the prisoner's comment, "but knew no help but in God and the patience which He had given me. And how His gracious providence over me, and His goodness to me wrought upon all this I shall in the end discover, and will magnify, however it succeed with me."

The search for papers was for the object, there could be no doubt, of procuring evidence against the Archbishop. Already committees had been searching for information. They had taken notes of all the complaints that could be got together against the Star

Chamber or High Commission, with a view of using them in the trial. They had examined Sir Kenelm Digby as to Laud's relations with Rome, from whom they gained nothing but an assurance that the Archbishop was a true Anglican. Parliament a few days after the search suspended him *ab officio et beneficio et omni et omnimodo jurisdictione archiepiscopali.*

The preparations for the trial now began to proceed apace. He was allowed only to have copies of the papers that had been taken from him made at his own expense. The documents themselves were preserved for use against him. The "popish plot" revealed by Habernfeld was served up by Prynne as "Rome's Masterpiece," an ingenious attempt to turn a supposed scheme against the King's and the Archbishop's lives into a proof of the latter's collusion with Roman agents. The Diary and the Prayer-Book proved a mine of information; and soon rumour reached the prisoner—and even preachers told their congregations in his presence—that great things had been discovered. He had been promised that all should be returned within three or four days, but the bitter lawyer was too keen to use every possible evidence to think fit to keep his word.[1] After five months Prynne's "malice had hammered out something," and ten additional articles were brought up by the Commons against Laud.

The next month was spent in petitions for counsel, for papers, for distinction in the charges. At length the trial began. From this period we are overwhelmed with evidence. The Record Office has masses of papers

[1] I think there can be little doubt that the papers taken by Prynne (twenty-one bundles) are those now preserved at the Record Office.—*State Papers, Domestic*, vol. ccccxcix.

relating to the charges and the trial. The journals of the House of Lords record all formal decisions. Rushworth[1] professes to give a detailed account of each day's business, which is repeated with addition from Laud's own MS. in the *State Trials*. Prynne's *Canterburie's Doome* goes over the same ground with malicious comment. William Clarke, then a young man beginning to study the law, attended the House from time to time, and kept a more or less detailed account of the proceedings, both from his own knowledge and from report. The Archbishop himself, with painful persistence, each day recorded, after all the strain of the examination and the speaking, the pitiful progress of the trial which would, as he firmly believed, acquit him with honour in the eyes of foreign nations and of posterity. The materials are so enormous that it would be impossible to give any complete account of the case in any form but a separate volume. It must suffice to sketch the course of the proceedings, laying stress only on the most vital points, and on those details which the MS. of William Clarke, now used for the first time, adds to the familiar authorities.

On November 13, 1643, Laud, after his long and weary imprisonment, at last stood at the bar. He was brought by Alderman Pennington, then Lieutenant of the Tower, by water to Westminster. As he looked across at Lambeth, which he was never again to enter, he may well have thought of the night when his danger was first made plain to him, and he fled over the river in his grey cloak to take refuge where he was now

[1] What appear to be Rushworth's original notes are among Lord Braye's MSS. (see *Hist. MSS. Comm., Report X.*, part 6, p. 118 *sqq.*).

to be tried for his life. "Upon the Archbishop's coming into the House of Peers," says Clarke, "the articles and charges against him in the name of the House of Commons and of the Commons of England were read, unto which he pleaded 'Not Guilty' in that manner and form as it was there laid down; and then making a short apology for himself, gave their honours thanks that they were pleased to allow him counsel, and desired that in regard he was unacquainted with matters of law, and unfit to speak for himself in that particular, their lordships would be pleased to accept of his answer from his counsel, which their lordships assented unto."

The proceedings indeed were little more than formal. Laud made a pathetic allusion to his "great years, being threescore and ten complete, and my memory and other faculties by age and affliction much decayed." He saw that some of the Lords watched him narrowly, and he was thankful that they found him "in a calm" where they thought he "would have been stormy."

He was not brought again before the Lords till January 16. Meanwhile, that he "might not rust," as he quaintly says, he was called on to answer also in the Commons, as a collateral defendant with Cosin, to the charges of Peter Smart of Durham. Not content with trying him for his life, his foes must needs take each trumpery accusation that was brought forward, while the gravest charges were still pending. When he again appeared in the House of Lords he was to give an answer to the first general articles, and this was deferred till the 22nd. On that day he drove through the streets amid frost and snow, and "a most bitter day," while the people railed on him as he passed. He put in his answer, a plea of

"not guilty" on all counts, with a special claim for exemption from all charge in relation to the Scots disturbances by the Act of Indemnity, passed that session, which covered all acts, howsoever they trenched upon law or liberty, committed in the whole business.

So he departed, and was put off from day to day; now summoned in Smart's case, now ordered to attend, now deferred. At length the trial began in earnest, on Tuesday, March 12, 1643.

In the House of Lords, where he had so often sat as the first subject in the realm, the Archbishop of Canterbury stood at the bar for long hours, often from early in the morning till two o'clock, and then again from four to half-past seven. Only a strong constitution—though Laud was always ailing during his long life—could have borne the fatigue and anxiety. Yet his extraordinary vivacity and acuteness, his wonderful memory, the readiness of his replies and the absolutely fearless assertion of his opinions, won the astonishment of his enemies, as they deserve the admiration of posterity.

The trial was indeed a pitiable performance. Only the bitterness of Prynne, who managed the case for the Commons, supplied the counsel with notes, and "kept a kind of school of instruction for" the witnesses, and the occasional outbreak of savage vindictiveness in the evidence, could have suggested to an ignorant bystander that a great man was standing trial for his life. The peers treated the affair with scandalous levity. At the most, on any day, there were but thirteen or fourteen present, and of these not two-thirds sat the whole day. Never was the House the same in the afternoon, for the defence, as

it was in the morning, for the accusation; and not a single peer save the Speaker, Lord Grey of Warke, whose presence was necessary to make a house, was present at the whole trial. Never in English history, it may be truly said, was a more monstrous violation of justice and good feeling in the trial of a capital charge.

We are able, from Hollar's print,[1] and some contemporary allusions, to picture the scene. At the end of the House stood the empty throne, raised on three steps; behind and at the sides were such persons as were privileged to stand where they could best see the prisoner. Beneath sat Lord Grey on the woolsack, with the judges and lawyers below. At each side were the benches of the peers. Behind the bar, and directly facing the Speaker, was the Archbishop, having on his right hand the Black Rod, and on his left his counsel, while behind him the Lieutenant of the Tower kept guard over the prisoner. In front, to the right of Laud, and between him and the Speaker, stood the clerk, who read over the evidence; and on the same side, but behind the bar, was the space where sat such of the Commons as came to the hearing—among them always "Mr. Prynne in the midst." Close to them were the witnesses, and the table where lay the books and papers that were to be given in evidence. The people stood without the high enclosure which faced the throne at the opposite end of the hall, gossiping and tattling of the evidence and the prospects of the trial.

[1] Prefixed to *Hidden Works of Darkness*, and to some copies of *Canterburie's Doome*.

It might seem to one who wandered in by chance, that, with all the bustle of the accusers and the listlessness of the judges, the suit resolved itself into a combat for life between the little old man, in his black gown, with a large tight black cap covering nearly all his head, and the dark, stern lawyer, with the long black hair that concealed his cropped ears. And so it was. Laud knew who was his real accuser, and learnt soon how little he regarded the rules of law in his eagerness to slay the man he hated; but though he fought bravely for his life, he forbore to resent the personal enmity of his antagonist, and "left him to the bar of Christ, whose mercy," he prayed, "would give him repentance and amend him."

The first day began with an order that each day's evidence should each day be answered by the Archbishop—an injustice made the more severe since he had so short a time to prepare himself, and was not allowed any help from his counsel, but only his faithful secretary Dell to hand him his papers. Serjeant Wilde opened the case in a florid speech which seemed more designed to catch the people than affect the Lords. Laud's reply was in the highest eloquence he ever attained. It was a masterly summary of the difficulties under which he laboured, coupled with a defence of his own religion and honour. "The laws of the land and the religion of those laws established"—against both these he was said to have offended. To both he stoutly asserted his entire obedience: and his defence of his faith, as we read it, rings true with the deep note of the full loyalty of an honest man. To the charge of Popery he had a ready answer. What

was there that could lure him to it, to the betrayal of his honour and the breach of every principle of his life? And what was there to keep him back if his conscience led him to Rome? Not wife, or children, or worldly comfort, or honour: "for whatsoever the world may be pleased to think of me, I have led a very painful life, and such as I could have been very well content to change, had I well known how. And had my conscience led me that way, I am sure I might have lived at far more ease; and either have avoided the barbarous libellings, and other bitter and grievous stories which I have here endured, or at the least been out of the hearing. Nay, my lords, I am as innocent in this business of religion, as free from all practice, or so much as thought of practice, for any alteration to Popery, or any way blemishing the true Protestant religion established in the Church of England, as I was when my mother first bare me into the world. And let nothing be spoken against me but truth," he cried, rising to the note of passion which his enemies looked for on charges less vital to his honour, "and I do here challenge whatsoever is between heaven and hell to say their worst against me in point of my religion: in which, by God's grace, I have ever hated dissimulation; and had I not hated it, perhaps it might have been better with me, for worldly safety, than now it is. But it can no way become a Christian bishop to halt with God."

Clarke summarizes his contention briefly, and says that he declared, "that if he had desired preferment for compliance with the Church of Rome, he might have had more honour in foreign parts than ever he was likely to obtain here, and that it was no outward

honour but his conscience that caused him to refuse the cardinal's hat."[1]

But the strongest argument against any fondness for Rome was the number of men that he had stayed, or brought back, from her fold. These he named one by one, that their cases might be patent evidence of his faith, and this touched his foes most nearly. As he went out Hugh Peters met him and told him, "that there were those ministers that could prove not only twenty-two, but two hundred, yea, some above five hundred that were converted by their diligent and faithful labours in the work of the ministry, and might have recalled more, had they not been silenced by him."[2]

The next day he was ordered to attend at nine in the morning, though the trial rarely began till two hours later. This day the political charges were taken—the endeavour to subvert the fundamental laws of the kingdom and the disparagement of Parliament. The counsel who introduced the charge was Maynard, and among the chief witnesses was Sir Henry Vane, who swore that after the ending of the Short Parliament, Laud had told the King that "now he might use his own power."[3]

Laud's summary of his answer gives the points clearly —"*The subversion of the fundamental laws.*[4] 1. I

[1] Clarke MS. The other authorities do not mention the reference to the cardinalate; but Laud may not have remembered everything he had said, and Clarke was probably present. But see Wharton's note, *Works*, iv. 66.

[2] Clarke MS. The last clause is omitted by Laud, who adds, however, that Peters "came as if he would have struck" him.

[3] The evidence was taken on commission, Vane being ill. Laud had of course no opportunity to cross-examine.

[4] *State Papers, Domestic*, vol. ccccxcix., no. 54. These are

humbly conceive this cannot be meant of the breach of any one or two laws, but of the whole frame of the law. For else every breach upon one or few laws were treason, which no man can say. 2. I never did or intended any thing (against) any main law of the kingdom, which may in any construction be capital, much less against the frame and body of the law. 3. I humbly conceive there can be no rational attempt against the body of the law but by force: I never had either power or intention for the use of any force. 4. For the Irish army [1]—it is to me as *non ens*. I never so much as heard it spoken of for England, but for Scotland only. 5. For the words in Sir Henry Vane's paper, I am sure I spake them not as he hath set them down. But if such words were spoken, they cannot be forced to make the speaker guilty of any intended subversion of the law. For 'some course must be taken' cannot imply that that course must needs be illegal. 6. And this I am sure of, that at the Council table, where I had the honour to sit, I did to the uttermost of my understanding keep myself as much to legal ways as any man. And this I know the Lord-Keeper Coventry would witness were he living; and I hope the honourable great men which yet sit there will testify as much for me."

Evidence of particular sharp sayings was brought against him—in most cases by only one witness—and stoutly denied by him. Much that was childish and incredible was alleged; some things that might be but slight perversions of the *obiter dicta* of an impetuous man. His promotion of Manwaring and Heylin were

---

probably the notes from which Laud spoke. He wrote his answer more fully in his history.

[1] As in the charge against Strafford.

charged against him, and the grant of subsidies in Convocation,—neither, surely, on the worst construction, evidence of high treason. So "this tedious day" ended.

The third day was but a brief session. In the interval he had been deprived even of the faithful Dell, and he made a vigorous protest to which the Lords were compelled to listen. The trial was resumed on Monday the 18th of March. He was then charged in relation to the restoration of S. Paul's, "a strange piece of treason, the repair of S. Paul's," said he: "the manner of doing it, by demolishing of men's houses," they retorted, was the charge. The day was spent in petty accusations, which Laud met with indomitable spirit and some sly touches of humour. He was charged from his Diary with projecting to give the London tithes to the clergy. He commented upon their condition under the new *régime*. "They are now under the taskmaster of Egypt; the tale of brick must be made, they must preach twice a Sunday, get straw where they can." He had already had experience, from the sermons he had heard since he was imprisoned, of the shifts the ministers were set to to "get straw" for their discourses.

Then came the cases of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick. It was easy for him to show how little Prynne limited himself to the truth. After more petty baiting about S. Paul's, the day ended with Laud's terse observations—

"First, that here have been thirteen witnesses at least produced in their own cause. Secondly, that whereas here have been so many things urged this day about the Star Chamber and the Council table, the

Act made this Parliament for the regulating of the one and the taking away of the other takes no notice of anything past; and yet acts past (and those joint acts of the Council and not mine) are urged as treasonable, of conducing to treason, against me. Nay, the Act is so far from looking back, or making such offences treason, as that if any offend in future, and that several times, yet the Act makes it but misdemeanour, and prescribes punishments accordingly."

So the trial went on from day to day, March 22, April 16, May 4, 16, 20, 27, June 6, 11, 17, 20, 27, July 5, 17, 24, 29, September 2, 11, 14, October 11, and November 16. Laud's trouble was greatly increased —and the expense alone was six or seven pounds a day to him—by his being frequently summoned, and then obliged, after waiting some hours, to return to the Tower unheard. This happened on April 4, 8, 22, 28, 30, May 13, 22, 25, June 6, July 15. The accounts of the trial are full to tediousness: Laud noted the evidence and the replies with indomitable patience, and the young law student Clarke grew more eager each day to put down the particulars. There is little to relieve the bitterness and malice that disfigure the dreary record, save the quaint flashes of humour that break out now and again in the old man's history. The terse shrewdness with which from time to time he summed up in a word his reply to long charges shows the vigour and concentration of mind which never deserted him.

"I did in general put the Lords in mind that nothing of late times was done either in Star Chamber or at Council table which was not done in King James's or Queen Elizabeth's times, before I was born,"—an unanswerable argument if they stood by precedents.

"I had liturgies, all I could get, both ancient and modern. I had also the Alcoran in divers copies. If this be an argument, why do they not accuse me to be a Turk?"

"Shall I bow to man in each House of Parliament, and shall I not bow to God in His House?"

When one said there were copes used in the Oxford colleges, and that a traveller would say "that he saw just such a thing on the Pope's back,"—"This wise man might have said as much of a gown. He saw a gown on the Pope's back, therefore a Protestant may not wear one; or, entering into S. Paul's, he may cry, 'Down with it, for I saw the Pope in just such another church in Rome.'"

They made a great matter of his denying the Pope to be Antichrist. He had said nothing about it, he declared, but "'Tis true I did not, I cannot, approve foul language in controversies. Nor do I think the calling of the Pope Antichrist did ever yet convert an understanding Papist."

The patience and self-control of the man were indeed marvellous. Day after day he had to stand and hear himself railed upon in the coarsest language; day after day to see his trial conducted with a disregard of the rules of ordinary procedure of which even a country justice might have been ashamed. As he went to and fro in the streets, and at the landing-stage at Westminster, his enemies reviled him. One day a coarse fellow came up and asked aloud "What the Lords meant to be troubled so long and so often with such a base fellow—they should do well to hang him out of the way." The last and bitterest blow was the publication of his Diary, the record of his most private thoughts

garbled and distorted by the annotations of Prynne. On September 2 he was to make the recapitulation of his whole cause. "But as soon as I came to the bar I saw every lord present with a thin new book in folio, in a blue coat. I heard that morning that Mr. Prynne had printed my Diary, and printed it to the world to disgrace me.[1] Some notes of his own are made upon it. The first and the last are two desperate untruths, besides some others. This was the book then in the Lords' hands, and, I assure myself, that time picked for it that the sight of it might damp me and disenable me to speak. I confess I was a little troubled at it. But after I had gathered up myself, and looked up to God, I went on the business of the day."

It was indeed the extremity of cruelty; but it might speak to the mind of honest men all the more loudly in favour of his innocence.

"My very pockets searched; my Diary, my very Prayer-book taken from me, and after used against me; and that in some cases not to prove but to make a charge. Yet I am thus far glad, even for this sad accident. For by my Diary your Lordships have seen the passages of my life; and by my Prayer-book the greatest secrets between God and my soul; so that you may be sure you have me at the very bottom: yet, blessed be God, no disloyalty is found in the one, no Popery in the other."

His speech was brief and pointed. With a dignified

[1] "A Breviate of the Life of William Laud, extracted (for the most part) verbatim out of his own Diary, and other writings under his own hand," 1644. The first scandal is that he caused the "cage" at Reading to be pulled down because it was opposite to the house he was born in; the second, that he dreamed at Oxford he should rise to great power, but in the end be hanged.

answer to the unworthy charges that had been made, he appealed to the statute of Edward III. which defined and limited the offence of high treason. Having so done he commended himself to the Providence of God. "And under that Providence, which will I doubt not work to the best to my soul that loves God, I repose myself."

At the next sitting his counsel, Hearn, addressed himself to the question of treason—a clear, conclusive argument. In none of the acts alleged, however grievous, was there "any treason by any established law of this kingdom." When the strange argument of "cumulative treason" had been used he had replied already, "I cry you mercy. This is the first time that e'er I heard that a thousand black rabbits did make one black horse."

The tedious trial had so far brought at least one result. It was clear even to the managers of the impeachment that not even the small body of terrorized peers could find the prisoner guilty on the counts with which he was charged. As in Strafford's case, it was plain that the formal process of law must be abandoned, and a bill of attainder must be brought in. Since Laud could not be proved to be a traitor, Parliament must declare that he was one, and condemn him as such.

On October 28, a petition of Londoners demanded that he should be executed as a traitor. On November 1 he was suddenly summoned to the House of Commons. Speaker Lenthall told him as he stood at the bar that a bill of attainder was brought in, and he was desired to hear the summary of evidence. He was refused the aid of counsel, and required to answer on the 11th.

The long trial and the scattered evidence had now been compressed. The Commons charged him with an endeavour to "alter the true Protestant religion into Popery," and "an endeavour to subvert the laws of the kingdom." To the former charge there were the petty proofs of ceremonies, of the statue over S. Mary's porch at Oxford, of pictures in Bibles, and such like; to the latter the old charge of Sir Harry Vane, the Canons, and so forth. His answer was to the same effect as in the Lords—a denial of particulars, and an appeal to statute law.

"Mr. Speaker," he said, with the simple pathos of unvarnished truth, "I am very aged, considering the turmoils of my life, and I daily find in myself more decays than I make show of; and the period of my life, in the course of nature, cannot be far off. It cannot but be a great grief unto me, to stand at these years thus charged before ye. Yet give me leave to say thus much without offence: whatsoever errors or faults I may have committed by the way, in any my proceedings, through human infirmity—as who is he that hath not offended, and broken some statute laws too, by ignorance, or misapprehension, or forgetfulness, at some sudden time of action?—yet if God bless me with so much memory, I will die with these words in my mouth, 'That I never intended, much less endeavoured, the subversion of the laws of the kingdom; nor the bringing in of Popish superstition upon the true Protestant religion established by law in this kingdom.'"

So ended the day,—a "heavy business,"—and physical weakness at length broke down the stout old man for a while. Two days later he was called again to hear the

counsel reiterate the charge: he might not reply; and when he left the House the Bill was passed without more ado. William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, was attainted of High Treason, and to suffer the pains of death. The Bill was taken up to the Lords on November 16.[1]

It was urged with every argument of passion. The people, it was said, stood at the gates of the House clamouring to see justice done. "They should do well to agree to the ordinance," said Strode, "or else the multitude would force them to it." Essex returned a bold answer on behalf of the Lords' independence: but it was an independence which had long passed away.

It was little more than a form that the ordinance was debated by the Lords on four occasions, or that they desired a conference with the Commons as to the law of treason. The judges unanimously declined to give opinion as to the treason, "because they could not deliver any opinion in point of treason but what was particularly expressed to be treason in the statute of 25 Edward III."[2]

Thus the shadow of death hung over Laud through Christmas and the New Year. Christmas Day was kept by the Houses' order as a strict fast—"a fast never before heard of in Christendom." It was a sign that the historic Church which Laud had so faithfully served was powerless to save him.

On January 4 the Lords passed the Attainder,[3] and

[1] *Lords' Journals:* Clarke MS.

[2] *Lords' Journals.* There is doubt as to the number of peers present. Clarendon says not above twelve. The highest number asserted is fourteen.

[3] *Lords' Journals: Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, 1644-5, pp. 228,

two days later it was ordered "that on Friday next the Lieutenant of the Tower of London do deliver the said Archbishop into the custody of the Sheriffs of London, who are to see the execution of justice upon him performed according to the sentence of Parliament."[1]

The next day Laud sent in a pardon of the King dated April 12, 1643, but it was not allowed. The House even refused to abate any of the cruel rigours of the execution; but on the following morning they, "upon a most humble petition of the Archbishop, wherein he did not desire the Parliament for his life, but only that he might not die that of hanging by the neck, in that he was once a member of the Parliament, and some other reasons, the House of Commons concurred with the Lords that he should be beheaded on Friday next, and then the Sheriffs of London should see him executed in that manner accordingly."[2]

The same day that the Attainder was passed, the Lords agreed to the substitution of the "Directory" for the Book of Common Prayer, so that, as a member of the Commons wrote to his friend, "the Archbishop and the service-book died together."[3]

The last page of the History was written in a clear, bold hand, very unlike that of an old man on the verge of death, on January 3. "The rest shall follow as it comes to my knowledge," are the last words. Next day the Lieutenant of the Tower came to tell him that the ordinance was passed. He heard it calmly, and prepared

---

229. It was to be made no precedent of treason for the judges—a curious commentary on the justice of the Act.

[1] Clarke MS. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] W. Ashurst to Col. Moore, *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, *Report X.*, Appendix, pt. 4.

for death. He pleaded that he might have three of his friends to minister to him, Dr. Stern, Dr. Heywood, and Dr. Martin. The Lords agreed, but the Commons refused even this last request. They would allow only Dr. Stern, with two Puritan ministers—one or both to be present whenever Stern was with him. To one whose opinions on sacramental confession were well known, the Commons sank so low as thus to deny the possibility of its private use at the hour of death.

Burton in those last days "with two other godly reverend brethren" went to give him counsel; but he returned him thanks and would not see him.[1]

The calmness which his enemies had often declared that he lacked in life did not desert him at last. Prayer and fasting, the touching outpourings of humiliation and faith which his *Devotions* have made familiar, prepared his soul for the last agony. "He that had so long been a confessor could not but think it a release of miseries to be made a martyr."[2]

His last night was spent in peaceful slumber. He had prepared himself for the morrow, and to avoid any chance of ill-considered or distracted language in his last speech, he wrote out carefully all that he intended to say. Heylin, who almost worshipped him, and who has made the record of these last days read like the triumphant march of a victorious general, says quaintly —"As he did not fear the frowns, so neither did he covet the applause of the vulgar herd, and therefore rather chose to read what he had to speak unto the people than to affect the ostentation either of memory

[1] *The Grand Imposter Unmasked*, by Henry Burton.
[2] *A Briefe Relation of the Death and Sufferings*, &c. Oxford, 1644, p. 14.

or wit in that dreadful agony. As for the matter of his speech, besides what did concern himself and his own purgation, his great care was to clear his Majesty and the Church of England from any inclination to Popery."

When the morning came he continued in prayer till the officers arrived, when he went forth with them, having so cheerful and ruddy a countenance that men thought he had painted it till they saw it turn pale as ashes after the fatal blow. As he mounted the steps some still questioned and taunted him, but all was hushed when he stood forth on the scaffold to speak to the dense crowd that covered Tower Hill. It was a last sermon that he delivered, for in it he thought more of others than himself, and the pathos of it turned many who had reviled him to grieve at his murder.

"Good people," he began, "this is an uncomfortable time to preach; yet I shall begin with a text of Scripture, Hebrews xii. 2—'Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before Him, endured the Cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.'

"I have been long in my race," he said, "and how I have looked to Jesus, the Author and Finisher of my faith, He best knows. I am now come to the end of my race, and here I find the 'Cross'—a death of shame." Then he spoke of the affliction and its end, and still stoutly declared that he would not follow the imaginations that the people were setting up, as the three children would not worship the king's image. "Nor will I forsake the temple and the truth of God"

—it was his last word on Puritanism—"to follow the bleating of Jeroboam's calves in Dan and Bethel." He spoke of the people, "miserably misled"; of the King, "as sound a Protestant (according to the religion by law established) as any man in this kingdom"; of the Londoners, who cried round the Parliament House for blood; of his predecessors who had suffered before him, S. Alphege and Simon Sudbury—"though I am not only the first Archbishop, but the first man, that hath ever died by an ordinance in Parliament;" and lastly, of his religion and faithfulness to the laws. "What clamours and slanders I have endured for labouring to keep a uniformity in the external service of God, according to the doctrine and discipline of this Church, all men know and I have abundantly felt."

And so at last, "I have done. I forgive all the world, all and every of those bitter enemies which have persecuted me: and humbly desire to be forgiven of God first, and then of every man, whether I have offended him or not, if he do but conceive that I have. Lord, do Thou forgive me, and I beg forgiveness of him. And so I heartily desire you to join with me."

Then he prayed aloud, for pardon for the people and himself. When the Lord's Prayer had been said for the last time, he gave his manuscript to Stern, spoke to one whom he saw noting his speech and begged him not to publish a false or imperfect copy, and then prepared to die.

At the last moment, he saw through the boards of the scaffold the heads of the people below, and begged that they might be moved, lest his blood should fall upon them. Even then he was not to have peace, for Sir John Clotworthy, a rough Irishman, asked him,

"What was the comfortablest saying which a dying man would have in his mouth?" He answered meekly, "Cupio dissolvi et esse cum Christo." Still pressed, he said that the assurance was, "The Word of God concerning Christ and His dying for us." And then he turned away, to the executioner, "as the gentler and discreeter person." To him he said, giving him money, "Honest friend, God forgive thee, and I do: and do thy office upon me without mercy." Then he knelt down and prayed—

"Lord, I am coming as fast as I can: I know I must pass through the shadow of death before I can come to Thee; but it is but *umbra mortis*, a mere shadow of death, a little darkness upon nature: but Thou, by Thy merits and passion, hast broken through the jaws of death. The Lord receive my soul, and have mercy upon me, and bless this kingdom with peace and plenty, and with brotherly love and charity, that there may not be this effusion of Christian blood amongst them, for Jesus Christ His sake, if it be Thy will." A moment more in silent prayer, and then he said, "Lord, receive my soul," and all was over.

Beautiful and courageous the death seemed even to his enemies, and the prayer breathed the confidence of one who had learned to know God as his Redeemer and Friend. "Never did man," as Heylin truly says, "put off mortality with a better courage, nor look upon his enemies with more Christian charity." His worst foes would say that nothing in his life became him like his leaving it. The boldest heart might rejoice to meet death so nobly.

From the hour of his death the reaction set in. The tide of war surged far away from where his body was

laid to rest; but in his grave the first strength of the new Restoration movement was sown. The King might fight and fall, but the permanence of the English Church was assured by the martyrdom, as it was soon felt to be, of her greatest son.

Within a few days came out the copy of his last speech, which Hinde the printer had taken down as it was spoken.[1] A little later Heylin published at Oxford "A briefe relation of the death and sufferings . . . . with a more perfect copy of his speech and other passages on the scaffold than hath been hitherto imprinted."[2] Dering, who had so bitterly attacked him, and whose shallow mind so faithfully reflected the currents of popular feeling, soon came to say that S. Paul's would be his perpetual monument, and his book against the Jesuit his lasting epitaph.

The enemies of the Church soon saw the effects of

[1] The Archbishop of Canterbury's Speech, or His Funerall Sermon,
Preacht by himself on the Scaffold on Tower Hill, on Friday the 10th January, 1644, Upon Hebrews 12, 1, 2.
Also, the Prayers which he used at the same time and place before his Execution.
All faithfully Written by John Hinde, whom the Archbishop beseeched that he would not let any wrong be done him by any phrase in false Copies.
Licensed & Entered according to Order.
London, granted by Peter Cole, at the signe of the Printing-Presse in Cornhill, neer the Royall Exchange, over against Pope's-head-alley, 1644.
The copy lent me by my friend Mr. Firth has corrections, "where the dashes or lines are drawn is more than was in the perfeckt copy of my Lord's own writing and what is written in the margent or interlined is left out and it hath been carefully perused."

[2] Oxford, 1644 (1645). It is not stated to be by Heylin, but its practical identity with the last pages of his *Cyprianus Anglicus* leaves little doubt of the authorship.

their act, and endeavoured too late to prevent them. The *Mercurius Britannicus*, before the month was out, declared that the last speech ought never to have been printed "by a penman and printer of our own"; and thought it worth while to contradict its statements *seriatim*, as a "piece of cunning close-couched scandal against religion, reformation, and the Parliament."

Burton burst out into a frenzied denunciation, accusing the murdered man of hypocrisy, blasphemy, and many crimes, and calling him "Satan's second child," and an "inveterate adversary of Christ" "wilfully damning his own soul." Other libels as bitter were published.[1] They were signs that all right-thinking men regretted the act when it could not be recalled. The ballad-mongers who had sung his crimes and his disgrace now sang his merits and his martyrdom.[2]

His body lay for some hours in the Tower, and was buried next day in a vault in the church of All Hallows, Barking, followed to the grave by "great multitudes of people whom love, or curiosity, or remorse of conscience had drawn together purposely to perform that office." The Prayer-Book service, though long disused and now

[1] "The Grand Imposter unmasked, or a detection of the notorious hypocrisy and desperate impiety of the late Archbishop (so styled) of Canterbury, cunningly couched in that written copy which he read on the scaffold at his execution, Jan. 10, 1644, alias, called by the public his funeral sermon. By Henry Burton."

[2] Cf. *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, 1644-5, p. 24—

> "Can Britain's patriarchal peer expire,
> And bid the world good-night, without a choir
> Of saints to sing his requiem, and toll
> A blessing bell unto his dying soul?" etc.

condemned, was read by a priest named Fletcher.[1] Dr. Layfield the vicar, Laud's nephew, had been some years in prison.

The parish of All Hallows never ceased to cherish the memory of the great man who was buried in its noble church. Round the place where his body was laid clustered before long the graves of devoted friends and eminent Churchmen, as though the place where the martyr slept were counted holy by those who best loved the Church. Eusebius Andrewes, George Snaith (his faithful friend and servant), John Kettlewell, and the vicars Edward Layfield and John Gaskarth, were laid to rest near the spot where the Archbishop was interred. Nor did the people remember him less than the priests and scholars: Laud became a Christian name in Barking.

Memorials soon began to appear. In 1646 the House of Commons were informed that an almanack had been put forth by Captain George Wharton, student in astronomy, "wherein the Archbishop is entered in the Calendar for a martyr";[2] and Thomas Vaughan[3] in his poetic epitaph exclaimed—

"Now a new list of martyrs is begun."

Some years later, after the King too had mounted the scaffold, a beautiful medal testified to the popular feeling. On one side is a fine portrait of the Archbishop,

[1] The entry in the Register is—

Burialls. Ano Dō: 1644 and 1645.

January	Died 10	Buried 11	William Laude Archbishop of Canterbury Beheaded [*erasure*]

[2] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, 1645-7, pp. 600, 601.

[3] Thomas Vaughan (*Eugenius Philalethes*), brother of Henry Vaughan the Silurist. Canon Wilton has published a beautiful translation of the *Epitaphium Gulielmi Laud.*

probably one of the best likenesses that exist, with the inscription GVIL. LAVD. ARCHIEPISC. CANTVAR. X. JAN. 1644. The reverse shows a view of London, the Thames and Lambeth, while above one cherub is carrying up a mitre and pastoral staff, and is followed by two others bearing a crown, sceptre, and orb. The legend reads SANCTI CAROLI PRAECURSOR.[1]

The Restoration brought back Laud to S. John's, where he had wished to be buried, "under the altar or Communion table there." Juxon had been buried with great state in the chapel of his old college on July 9, 1663. Three weeks later the leaden coffin containing the remains of Laud was removed from All Hallows,[2]

[1] This medal was executed by John Roettier, soon after the Restoration. Another medal has the portrait, but with plain reverse.

[2] He was not forgotten at All Hallows. The following poem, in the Vestry book for 1663, records the removal of his body and eulogizes his fame.

Upon the Remoue of ye most Rev^{end} William
Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterburie his bodie from
Allhallowes Barking London, to St John's Colledg in
Oxford, July ye 21^{h} 1663.

When first Injustice Pack't up his High-Court,
When Vsurpation grau'd a Broad Seale for't,
When Death, in Butchers : dres did th' axe advance,
And Tragique : purpose with all Circumstance
Of Fright & Feare tooke up the fatall Stage
To act Rebellion in it's Rule, and Rage
When Friendship fainted, and late : Love stark dead,
When few own'd him, whom most men honored,
Then **Barkinge** home, then (thus by th' world forsooke)
The butcherd Bodie of ye Martyre tooke,
Tore up her quiett Marble, lodg'd him sure
In ye cheife Chamber of her Sepulture ;
Where he intire, and undisturb'd hath bin,
Murther'd & mangl'd tho at's laying in,
Where he's vntainted too, free from distrust
Of a vile mixture with Rebellious dust ;

and brought privately—as had been his express direction —by a number of the Fellows at 10 o'clock at night through the deserted streets, and in by the gate of the grove to the chapel. Then when the Vice-President had spoken a solemn oration in the presence of the college and of the Vice-Chancellor, and some heads of houses, the coffin[1] was laid in a vault under the altar between the founder and Juxon. There it still rests; and the college which he loved so dearly and endowed so generously counts it her highest honour to guard the bones of the greatest of her sons.

To make that sure, Braue Andrew's[2] begg'd it meet
To Rott at's Coffin, and to rise at's Feet.
But now our Learned Lawd's to Oxford sent,
St. John's is made **St. William's** Monument,
Made so bym'self; This pious Primate's knowne
Best, by the Bookes, and Buildings of his owne,
Whome, though th' accursed age did then deny
To lay him, where ye Royall Reliques lye,
Which was his due; At's Bodies next Remoue
Hee'l Rise, and Reigne amongst ye blest aboue.

[1] The coffin had on it a small brass plate, with the Archbishop's arms and the following inscription: "In hac cistulâ conduntur exuviae Gulielmi Laud, Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis; qui securi percussus, immortalitatem adiit die x Januarii, aetati suae, LXXII, Archiepiscopatûs XII." A similar plate was affixed by William Dell, the Archbishop's faithful secretary, to the south wall of the college chapel, above the sedilia, and within a few feet of the grave, where it still remains.

[2] Colonel Eusebius Andrewes.

CHAPTER VIII.

MEMORIALS AND CHARACTER.

SOMETHING has already been said of the devotion with which Laud came to be regarded from the moment of his death. A character which had seemed to some hard and unsympathizing, was recognized to contain the strength and the spiritual power in which are found the seed of the Church of Christ. Men soon began to cherish his memory, to preserve his relics, and to carry out his principles.

The Church of England as she now stands, it has been said, is Laud's truest memorial. His energy, and his devotion—that true spirit of the ecclesiastical statesman who builds not for the present but for the future—preserved her through the storms of political revolution, and gave her the unity and solidarity with which she returned at the Restoration. But his memory was kept alive in the mind of future generations by many tangible memorials. His will, written in the Tower a year before his death, is a simple but glowing record of the generosity which had been one of the brightest features of his life. He was a poor man: no

archbishop for centuries, it was said, had ever been so poor. As he had given in his life, so he bequeathed in death, with a particular generosity which was the evidence of a personal affection. To his kinsfolk, the grandchildren of his mother, he left each some money; to all who had been his chaplains some memorial, a ring or watch that had been his own. To each of his servants he left money, and for many he had already provided. To the poor of all the parishes with which he had been connected—S. Mary Magdalen and S. Giles in Oxford, Stanford, North Kilworth, Ibstoke, Cuckston, Norton, West Tilbury, Crick, Huntingdon, Lincoln, Carmarthen, Abergwili, Brecon, Wells, Fulham, Canterbury, Croydon, and Lambeth—he left benefactions. The University of Oxford he had endowed with an Arabic Readership, and his munificent gift of MSS. had enriched the Bodleian. Reading, his birthplace, had been especially favoured. He bequeathed to it property, besides the money he had already given—endowments for ministers, for scholars, apprentices, and maidens deserving of a marriage-portion. Most of these are enjoyed, not always without contest, to the present day.[1] His benefactions to other places in Berkshire were also large.[2] His personal friends, the Duchess of Buckingham, widow of his dear friend whom he had never forgotten, her son and daughter,

[1] See Statement of the Municipal Charities, Reading, 1890; and a Criticism of the Rev. C. R. Honey (declaring that no restriction to Church folk was intended by Laud). Particulars of the early use of the benefactions will be found in *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, *Report XI.*, App., pt. 7, pp. 197, 198, 205, etc. It appears that some of the early applicants for the charity claimed to be of kin to the Archbishop.

[2] These have been chronicled by Mr. John Bruce for the Berkshire Ashmolean Society, 1841.

and his "much-honoured friend, William Lord, Marquis of Newcastle," received tokens of his remembrance. And there was a bequest more touching still. "Item: I take the boldness to give to my dear and dread Sovereign, King Charles (whom God bless), £1000, and I do forgive him the debt which he owes me, being £2000, and require that the two tallies for it be given up."

To S. Paul's he left £800; to his own college all his chapel plate and furniture, all the books in his study at the time of his death, and £500 to buy land. "Something else I have done for them already, according to my ability; and God's everlasting blessing be upon that place and that society for ever." "Something else" he had indeed done, "according to his ability." When the college, at her founder's prayers, yearly reads the commemoration of "rich men furnished with ability," she cannot choose but think of the most generous of them whom in all her past history she has known.

The college which he loved is indeed his abiding memorial. The beautiful and unique building which he added to the glories of Oxford architecture stands yet, with its dark panelled rooms and its bright comfortable library, as the witness of his munificence and his taste. Pictures of him, one at least, it may be, from Vandyke's own hand, and busts by Hubert le Sueur, who made for him the royal statues which stand still in their sculptured niches where his loyalty placed them, recall to those who yet read his books and enjoy his benefactions what manner of man he was. There are other still dearer relics. A pastoral staff, found in the college after the Restoration, may or may

not have been his. The gorgeous vestments which the founder gave to the chapel may never have been worn by Laud, though they were almost certainly used in his time. But the large skull-cap, which fell from his head on the scaffold, and the staff on which he leant as he walked to execution, were undoubtedly his own.[1]

And most precious of all are the two books in which his clear bold hand traced the record of his life and of his troubles. The Diary is a small octavo volume, written in very neat penmanship, in lines small and close together. There are many erasures and insertions, as in a book which was much used and intended for no eye but the writer's. A large part of the year 1640 is burnt out: this was done when the book was in Prynne's hands, whether by carelessness or malice it is impossible to say. Upon the old cover of the book were written by Archbishop Sancroft the following words—"Archbishop Laud's original Diary. Great care to be taken of it." The History of his Troubles and Trial is a larger

[1] The following inscription is placed on the case containing the ebony and ivory walking-stick—

Hoc baculo dextrans subeunte
Gressus suos firmavit
Gulielmus Laud.
Archiepiscopus Cantuar.
idemque hujus collegii Benefactor
insignis, cum ad mortem
immeritam ductus esset.
Praesidenti et sociis
Coll. Divi Johannis Baptistae
d. d.
Gul. Aubrey Phelp, A.M.
Ecclesiae de Stanwell
in Com. Middlesex Vicarius.
A.D. MDCCCXV.

volume, written on one side of the page, with occasional additions and corrections opposite. It was first placed in the college most probably by Dr. Baylie, his executor, and was, with the Diary, for a time in the hands of Archbishops Sheldon and Sancroft. Both were published by Henry Wharton in 1694.

From these two volumes it may be said that the great Tory and Church movement which was so striking a feature of the age of Anne received no inconsiderable part of its strength. The great figure round whom the later Caroline divines, the eminent writers of the reign of Charles II. and the learned and chivalrous non-jurors, clustered, was undoubtedly William Laud, in whom the Church principles which they held dear seemed to be personified and hallowed. The publication of Laud's *Works*, and particularly his *Devotions*, exercised on Church feeling a parallel influence to that exercised on politics by the immortal history of Clarendon.

An *officium quotidianum*, being the earlier part of his *Devotions*, was issued in 1660 and in 1663. In 1667, 1683, 1688, 1705, other and enlarged editions appeared. The Diary and the History were published in 1695 by Henry Wharton.[1] The public mind had been prepared both by the general loyal reaction and by the great influence of the *Devotions* to regard the Archbishop as a great and sincere champion of the Faith. But the Diary and the History for the first time revealed fully to the world what manner of man was he who had so profoundly affected the history of the Church. Sheldon and Sancroft were both eager

[1] Prynne's garbled version of the Diary gives no true idea of its contents. Laud himself regarded the History as his vindication, and especially desired that it should be translated into Latin, to explain his position to foreign nations.

to vindicate his memory by issuing these genuine memorials of his life, but it was reserved for Henry Wharton to carry out their intention. His aim in the matter is quite clear. He was enthusiastic for the memory of the great English Churchman. "I regard it," he wrote in the preface to the edition of 1695, "the most fortunate transaction of my whole life to have contributed herein to the vindication of the memory and the cause of that most excellent prelate and blessed martyr, to whom I have always paid a more especial veneration, ever since I was able to form any judgment in these matters, as firmly believing him to have taken up and prosecuted the best and most effectual method, (although then in great measure unsuccessful, through the malignity of the times), and to have had the noblest, the most zealous, and most sincere intentions therein, towards re-establishing the beauty, the honour, and the force of religion in that part of the Catholic Church (the Church of England) to the service of which I have entirely devoted my life, my labours, and my fortunes." To Wharton Laud was the martyr of the Catholic faith in the English Church. The Church, however, which deemed Charles a martyr did not bestow the same honour upon the Archbishop. In a sense indeed it may be said that Laud did not deserve the title as did the King. He died unquestionably in consequence of his bold profession of opinions for which he would gladly have given his life, but he had no choice to change those opinions, or to save his life by abandoning his principles. But he had taught Charles to suffer for the truth: he had instilled into him, there can be no question, that one last consistent faith, the belief in the paramount claim on his allegiance of the English

Church in its spiritual completeness, which, amid all his changes and in all his desperate shifts, he never abandoned. The one firm point in Charles's mind was his devotion to the essential system of the Church—its threefold ministry and its Catholic faith. Everything but this he would sacrifice : he would consent that the bishops should be controlled by synods or by presbyters, he would agree to the establishment of Presbyterianism for five years, but he would never abandon the foundations upon which the historic Church was laid.

To the superficial or unobservant there might seem a very small difference between a moderated episcopacy responsible to assemblies and the direct government of the assemblies themselves, between a state-established Presbyterianism and a suppression of the episcopal order and the threefold ministry; but Charles had learnt that in the difference, small though it seemed, lay the core of the whole matter. Should the English Church divide itself from the historic Christianity with which its Reformation in all its iconoclastic vehemence had so carefully preserved the essential links? Laud had confirmed the clergy in the answer which had been made by the fathers of the Church under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. Charles had learnt from him to cling desperately to the essential fabric of the Church. "I assure you," he wrote at a time of the deepest stress, "the change would be no less and worse than if Popery were brought in, for we should have neither lawful priests, nor sacraments duly administered, nor God publicly served, but according to the foolish fancy of every idle parson." [1] The words, written a year after the Archbishop's execution, have a curious

[1] See Gardiner's *History of Civil War*, vol. iii. p. 135.

Laudian ring about them. The King's confessor had not lived and died in vain. He had taught Charles that if everything else was made matter of barter, was used to snatch a temporary advantage, in negotiation or intrigue, never for the Crown's necessities must the historic Church itself be abandoned or put in pawn.

As Charles in his controversy with Henderson [1] showed this one last firmness of his vacillating mind, so when the last struggle came he still refused to save his life, as there can be little doubt he could have done, by surrendering and deserting the Church of his fathers. In this sense it is that Charles was, and that Laud made him, a martyr. This is the real meaning of the long contest. In this sense Dr. Mozley's statement is fully justified—"Laud saved the English Church."

Beside interest of such historic importance as this the petty criticisms of controversialists, or of narrowly prejudiced writers such as Macaulay or Hallam, sink into insignificance. Argument as to the right or wrong of the details of Laud's action is irrelevant till the issues before him and the principles upon which he acted are intelligently appreciated. Laud claimed to be the devoted son of the historic Church in England. "I die as I have lived,"—it is the solemn profession of faith in his last testament,—"in the true orthodox profession of the Catholic faith of Christ, foreshadowed by the prophets and preached to the world by Christ Himself, His blessed Apostles and their successors; and a true member of His Catholic Church, within the communion of a living part thereof, the present Church of England, as it stands established by law." That

[1] See Von Ranke, *History of England*, vol. ii. p. 466.

was his claim and his firm belief. It would take a theological treatise to examine his opinions in relation to every article of the Christian creed; but on two at least, which are central points of historic criticism and controversy, it is clear that he trod in the footsteps of the primitive and historic Church.

In the doctrine of the Eucharist, as his Jesuit critic [1] states, he admits neither the transubstantiation of Roman theologians nor the consubstantiation of Luther. He has no need to resort to such modern definitions. He will not pass beyond the reverent reticence of the early Church. "In the Most Blessed Sacrament," he says to Fisher, "the worthy receiver is by his faith made spiritually partaker of the true and real Body and Blood of Christ truly and really, and of all the benefits of His Passion." But he does not restrict the Presence, though he does limit the benefits, to the worthy communicant. The corporal (in the sense of carnal) Presence he does again and again deny; but he is far from denying the objective Reality. He quotes with approbation the statement of Ridley, that he and his opponents were agreed—and it would be well, he says, if some Protestants did not "except against it" —"that [2] *in the Sacrament* is the very true and natural Body and Blood of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into Heaven, which sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, which shall come again to judge the quick and the dead; only we differ *in modo,* in the way and manner of being; we confess all one Thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent *in the manner of being there.*" The

[1] *Laud's Labyrinth*, p. 308.
[2] *Works*, ii. 330.

dispute to him was simply between the rigid Roman definition and the reverent Catholic faith. "The altar is the place of God's Presence, and the Sacrament commemorates and represents (*i. e.* presents again in memorial) the great sacrifice offered up by Christ Himself." [1] Laud's language on the Eucharist, to say the very least, is undeniably patient of a fully Catholic interpretation.

The same is true of the "doctrine of intention." He recognized, as do so many modern theologians of the Roman obedience, the difficulty of any definition which should require a definitely Catholic belief on each occasion of the celebration of a sacrament.[2] Still more clear is his assertion of apostolic succession and the essential necessity of Episcopacy. The Church government by bishops is not alterable by human law. "Bishops may be regulated and limited by human laws in those things which are but incidents to their calling; but their calling, as far as it is *jure divino*, by Divine right, cannot be taken away."[3] He accepts the statements of Hall and Bilson, and appeals to the historical statement of the English Ordinal. Laud certainly held no less strong an opinion than Parker. "Up to the period of the Reformation there was no other idea of Episcopacy except that of transmission of Apostolic commission: that the ministry of Episcopal government could be introduced without such a link was never contemplated until Bubenhagen reconstituted a nominal Episcopate in Denmark, and this was an example not likely to be

[1] See *Works*, ii. 340.

[2] Cf. the Abbé Duchesne in the *Bulletin Critique* of July 15, 1894: "N'oublions pasqu'une partie du clergé français dérive son ordination de M. de Talleyrand."

[3] *Works*, iv. 309—311.

taken in England; nor was it so accepted."[1] It is perfectly clear that it was not accepted by Laud.

Laud never consciously departed from the standards of the English, or of the Universal, Church. In this lay the value of the service which he rendered to England. At a time when political difficulties and religious enthusiasms were tending more than ever to accentuate the differences between the great body of the Latin Church and the foreign reformed sects, Laud's determination and force asserted, with a clearness which it was impossible to mistake, the claim of the English Church to be part of the continuous historic fold, joined still, in spite of division, by the one Catholic faith. How far the claim was justified may be a point for theologians to dispute upon: it is impossible to deny that it was made and repeated by Laud with a power which impressed it upon succeeding generations. When the Church came back at the Restoration, it came back with no thought of withdrawing one jot of its Catholic claim. Juxon, Laud's nearest friend among ecclesiastics, and Sheldon, who was almost his pupil, acted entirely upon the principles for which Laud had been insistent. There was no question now, as there had been before 1645, of the possibility of a great Anglican schism. The Church adhered firmly to the Catholic creeds and the Apostolic ministry.

Carlyle said that Laud was "an ill-starred pedant," and "like a college tutor whose whole world is forms, college rules." There is this truth in the statement—that he had learnt by his Oxford training at least the way to teach men. His methods, rough or formal

[1] See the weighty words of the Bishop of Oxford in his Second Charge, 1893, pp. 48 *sqq.*

though they might seem, were the methods of a man who has studied the art of education. They might be disliked, they might appear even to fail, but in the end they were successful, and their result proved indelible. Laud was, in the seventeenth century, the school-master of the English Church. She has not yet outgrown his teaching, nor is it probable that she ever will.

There were some noble words said by the Puritan Stephen Marshall at the funeral of Pym: "I beseech you let not any of you have one sad thought touching him; nor would I have you mourn out of any such apprehension as the enemies have, and for which they rejoice, as if our cause were not good, or we should lose it for want of hands to carry it on. No, beloved, this cause must prosper; and although we were all dead, our armies overthrown, and even our Parliament dissolved, this cause must prevail." These fine words are true of Pym's best work, but in matters of religion how much more truly may they be used of Laud! The more Englishmen study the history of the critical age in which he lived, the more they will reverence the memory of the man who preserved to the Church of England both her Catholicity and her freedom.

THE END.

Richard Clay & Sons, Limited, London & Bungay.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01237 9659

Date Due

JE 5 '50			